

Translated Texts for Historians

300–800 AD is the time of late antiquity and the early middle ages: the transformation of the classical world, the beginnings of Europe and of Islam, and the evolution of Byzantium. TTH makes available sources translated from Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Georgian, Gothic and Armenian. Each volume provides an expert scholarly translation, with an introduction setting texts and authors in context, and with notes on content, interpretation and debates.

Editorial Committee

Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, University of Oxford

Averil Cameron, Keble College, Oxford

Marios Costambeys, University of Liverpool

Carlotta Dionisotti, King's College, London

Peter Heather, King's College, London

Robert Hoyland, University of Oxford

William E. Klingshirn, The Catholic University of America

Michael Lapidge, Clare College, Cambridge

John Matthews, Yale University

Neil McLynn, Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Richard Price, Heythrop College, University of London

Claudia Rapp, Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik, Universität Wien

Judith Ryder, University of Oxford

Raymond Van Dam, University of Michigan

Michael Whitby, University of Birmingham

Ian Wood, University of Leeds

General Editors

Gillian Clark, University of Bristol

Mark Humphries, Swansea University

Mary Whitby, University of Oxford

A full list of published titles in the Translated Texts for Historians series is available on request. The most recently published are shown below.

Nemesius: On the Nature of Man

Translated with introduction and notes by R. W. SHARPLES and P. J. VAN DER EIJK
Volume 49: 283pp., 2008, ISBN 978-1-84631-132-1

Sources for the History of the School of Nisibis

Translated with introduction and notes by ADAM H. BECKER
Volume 50: 217pp., 2008, ISBN 978-1-84631-161-1

**Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553:
with related texts on the Three Chapters Controversy**

Translated with an introduction and notes by RICHARD PRICE
Volume 51: 2 vols, 384pp + 360pp, 2009, ISBN 9781846311789

**Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus – Advice to the Emperor,
Dialogue on Political Science, Paul the Silentiary – Description of Hagia Sophia**

Translated with notes and an introduction by PETER N. BELL
Volume 52: 249pp, ISBN 978-1-84631-209-0

History and Hagiography from the Late Antique Sinai

DANIEL F. CANER, with contributions by SEBASTIAN BROCK, RICHARD M. PRICE and KEVIN VAN BLADEL
Volume 53: 346pp, ISBN 978-1-84631-216-8

Orosius: Seven Books of History against the Pagans

Translated with introduction and notes by A. T. FEAR
Volume 54: 456pp., 2010; ISBN 978-1-84631-473-5 cased, 978-1-84631-239-7 limp

The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity

Translated by GEOFFREY GREATREX, with ROBERT PHENIX and CORNELIA HORN;
introductory material by SEBASTIAN BROCK and WITOLD WITAKOWSKI
Volume 55: 2010; ISBN 978-1-84631-493-3 cased, 978-1-84631-494-0 limp

Bede: On the Nature of Things and On Times

Translated with introduction and notes by CALVIN B. KENDALL and FAITH WALLIS
Volume 56: 371pp., 2010, ISBN 978-1-84631-495-7

Theophilus of Edessa's Chronicle

Translated with introduction and notes by ROBERT G. HOYLAND
Volume 57: 368pp., 2011, ISBN 978-1-84631-697-5 cased, 978-1-84631-698-2 limp

For full details of Translated Texts for Historians, including prices and ordering information, please write to the following:

All countries, except the USA and Canada: Liverpool University Press, 4 Cambridge Street, Liverpool, L69 7ZU, UK (*Tel* +44-[0]151-794 2233, *Fax* +44-[0]151-794 2235, Email janmar@liv.ac.uk, <http://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk>). **USA and Canada:** University of Chicago Press, 1427 E. 60th Street, Chicago, IL, 60637, US (*Tel* 773-702-7700, *Fax* 773-702-9756, www.press.uchicago.edu)

Translated Texts for Historians
Volume 60

The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom

Translated with an introduction and notes by
TIMOTHY D. BARNES and GEORGE BEVAN

Liverpool
University
Press



First published 2013
Liverpool University Press
4 Cambridge Street
Liverpool, L69 7ZU

Copyright © 2013 Timothy D. Barnes and George Bevan

The right of Timothy D. Barnes and George Bevan to be identified as the authors of this book has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A British Library CIP Record is available.

ISBN 978-1-84631-887-0 cased
978-1-84631-888-7 limp

Set in Times by
Koinonia, Manchester
Printed in the European Union by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Notes on the translations	xi
Chronology of John's life and posthumous rehabilitation	xii
Introduction	1
Funerary Speech for Bishop John	37
John's Letters from Exile	119
1. Introduction	121
2. Translation of thirty selected letters of John	135
Appendices	
A. The Council of the Oak	153
B. Theodoret's Lost Orations on John	160
C. John in the Calendar of the Church of Constantinople	164
D. Concordance to the <i>Funerary Speech</i>	171
E. Concordance to Editions of Palladius, <i>Historical Dialogue</i>	172
F. Concordance to John's <i>Letters to Olympias</i>	173
Map of Asia Minor	174
Bibliography	175
Index	186

PREFACE

The importance of the *Funerary Speech* for John Chrysostom was first brought to my attention by Michael Redies, a student of Alexander Demandt in Berlin who came to Toronto for a master's degree during the academic year 1994/95, after which he returned to Germany and abandoned the doubtful future of a career in the highly competitive world of German academe for the more promising realm of information technology, in which he had already developed considerable skills and in which he has subsequently prospered. It was Michael Redies who inspired me to compose the paper on the *Funerary Speech* which I delivered at the Thirteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies in Oxford in August 1999. During that conference I met Martin Wallraff, who had already begun work on a critical edition of the text: without hesitation, he most generously gave me permission to translate his Greek text into English when it was published, as it eventually was in 2007. On the same occasion, Gillian Clark suggested that I submit the projected translation to the Liverpool series Translated Texts for Historians as the most appropriate way of making the speech easily available to everyone interested in either John Chrysostom or more generally in the Later Roman Empire. I am most grateful to both of them for encouraging me to produce the present translation, which I would almost certainly never have undertaken without their encouragement. Let me add that the excellence of Wallraff's edition of the *Funerary Speech* can be gauged from the fact that my collaborator and I have found it necessary either to emend or to question the text which he prints in only a very few passages of this difficult work.

When Wallraff's edition was published, I was close to retirement from the University of Toronto and decided that I needed a reliable younger collaborator to share the labour of producing and annotating an acceptable translation. By good fortune George Bevan, the last doctoral student whom I supervised, was willing to assist me. George was interested in the project because he had written a thesis on the career of Nestorius, whose brief tenure of the see of Constantinople in 428–31 replicated John's earlier turbulent episcopate in several significant respects. George and I proceeded

as follows. George produced a draft translation of the *Funerary Speech* in the summer of 2007, which I then revised in Scotland beside an inland loch before returning to Toronto for my last term of teaching. Shortly before I left Toronto for Edinburgh at the end of December 2007, George and I met and discussed the changes which I had made in his draft translation. George then produced a preliminary draft of the commentary, which I intended to revise and expand during 2008. Two other tasks, however, claimed my almost exclusive attention for almost three years. The first was a series of lectures which I delivered in German in Jena in November 2008, and then revised and expanded into a book which was published in the spring of 2010. The second was a restatement of my controversial interpretation of the emperor Constantine, which I completed in August 2010 and which was published in April 2011. It was only after I had corrected the proofs and compiled the index of that book that I was able to turn my full attention to the funerary speech for John Chrysostom.

The composition of this book has thus had several distinct stages over several years. Although George Bevan prepared a full draft of the translation of the *Funerary Speech* and I revised it and discussed with him in 2007, it was only in the late autumn of 2010 that I began to revise and expand George's draft notes on the translation, to compose the introduction and to add the appendices. In August 2011 I submitted a full draft of the whole work to Mary Whitby in the knowledge that it was still very imperfect. Since then both Mary and Claudia Rapp have been exceptionally helpful in making the introduction more fit for purpose than it originally was, while both Mary and Richard Price have read the translation with great care and proposed many improvements. Mary then suggested that we include a selection of the letters which John wrote in exile, and Richard subsequently made our draft translation much more elegant in many passages. George Bevan came to Edinburgh in February 2012: we worked together for a week on the whole volume, and we met again in Ontario twice in the summer of 2012 to tidy up some loose ends. It must be emphasized, however, that, although I am immensely grateful to all the four friends whom I have named, especially George and Mary, for the advice that they have so freely and unstintingly given me, I alone am responsible for mistakes and flaws that remain because I have not always followed their advice.

Timothy D. Barnes

Edinburgh

14 September 2012

(being the 1605th anniversary of the death of John Chrysostom)

ABBREVIATIONS

§ We use the sigla § and §§ to refer to chapters of the *Funerary Speech*; where there are two numerals (e.g. § 48.8), the first refers to the chapter, the second to the line within the chapter in Wallraff's edition.

- ACO* *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, ed. E. Schwartz. 1. *Concilium Universale Ephesenum* (Berlin, 1927–30); 2. *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense* (Berlin, 1932–35)
- Barrington Atlas* *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ed. R.J.A. Talbert et al. (Princeton, NJ, and Oxford, 2000)
- BHG* *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, 3rd edn, Subsidia Hagiographica 8a (Brussels, 1957)
- BHG, Auct.* F. Halkin, *Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae*, Subsidia Hagiographica 47 (Brussels, 1969)
- Chr. min.* 1, 2 T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII* 1, 2, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 9, 11 (Berlin, 1892, 1894)
- Chr. Pasch.* *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae 16, 17 (Bonn, 1832); English translation by Michael and Mary Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, Translated Texts for Historians 7 (Liverpool, 1989)
- CPG* M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* 1–5 (Turnhout, 1974–87); M. Geerard and J. Noret, *Supplementum* (Turnhout, 1998); J. Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* 3A: *Addenda volumini III* (Turnhout, 2003)
- CPL* *Clavius Patrum Latinorum*, 3rd edn, ed. E. Dekkers et al. (Steenbrugge, 1995)
- CTh* *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. T. Mommsen and P.M. Meyer, *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis* 1.2: *Textus cum apparatu* (Berlin, 1904)¹
- GCS* *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1897–1918; Berlin, 1954–)

¹ Although the date of publication is commonly stated as 1905, both Mommsen's prolegomena to and his text of the Theodosian Code were among the newly published books formally presented to a meeting of the Prussian Academy of Sciences on 8 December 1904. Readers should be warned that the English translation by C. Pharr et al., *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions: A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography* (Princeton, NJ, and Oxford, 1952; repr. Union, NJ, 2001) is often inaccurate and misleading.

- Lampe G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968)
- LSJ H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek–English Lexicon*, 9th edn (Oxford, 1940), with *Supplement*, ed. E.A. Barber (Oxford, 1968)
- Montfaucon 1721 Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινοπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τὰ εὐρισκόμενα πάντα / *Sancti Patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant, vel quae eius nomine circumferuntur*, ed. B. de Montfaucon, 13 vols (Paris, 1718–38), vol. III
- ODB *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A.P. Kazhdan et al. (New York and Oxford, 1991)
- PCBE 1, 2 *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire* 1. *Prosopographie de l’Afrique chrétienne (303–533)*, ed. A. Mandouze (Paris, 1982); 2. *Prosopographie de l’Italie chrétienne (313–604)*, ed. C. and L. Pietri (Paris, 1999)
- PG J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (Paris, 1857–94)
- PL J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1844–1974)
- PLRE 1 A.H.M. Jones, J. Morris and J.R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* 1: A.D. 260–395 (Cambridge, 1971)
- PLRE 2 J.R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* 2: A.D. 395–527 (Cambridge, 1980)
- RE G. Wissowa and W. Kroll, *Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893–1980)
- Ricci M. Wallraff, *Oratio Funebris in Laudem Sancti Johannis Chrysostomi. Epitaffio attribuito a Martirio di Antiochia (BHG 871, CPG 6517)*, with an Italian translation by C. Ricci (Spoleto, 2007)
- Savile 1613 Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινοπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τῶν εὐρισκομένων τόμος πρῶτος κτλ. / *S. Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Graece*, ed. H. Savile, 8 vols (Eton, 1610–13), vol. VIII
- SC *Sources chrétiennes* (Lyon and Paris, 1943–44; Paris, 1945–)
- TLG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (www.tlg.uci.edu)
- Wallraff M. Wallraff, *Oratio Funebris in Laudem Sancti Johannis Chrysostomi. Epitaffio attribuito a Martirio di Antiochia (BHG 871, CPG 6517)*, with an Italian translation by C. Ricci (Spoleto, 2007)

NOTE ON THE TRANSLATIONS

Our translations are intended primarily for interested students and scholars who are not well versed in patristic Greek but need a reliable English version of the funerary speech for John Chrysostom, which one of his followers composed and delivered within weeks of John's death in September 407. This speech contains the earliest extant account of John's time as bishop of Constantinople. We have added a selection of 30 letters from the approximately 240 that John wrote after his exile in June 404. Our introduction, our notes to the *Funerary Speech for Bishop John* and our discussion of John's letters from exile concentrate primarily on elucidating obscurities and historical allusions in the text. Not infrequently, however, we have justified our interpretation of the Greek where other interpretations are possible and have attempted to explain the linguistic problems posed by the Greek text of the *Funerary Speech* as transmitted in the manuscripts. We note all the instances where our translation renders a text that diverges in any way from that printed by Martin Wallraff in his edition of 2007. Where the Greek seems particularly obscure or difficult (as it often is), we have used angled brackets (< >) to indicate that our translation has either added a word or words not in the Greek or has supplied a noun or a proper name where the Greek text has a potentially ambiguous pronoun. Readers should also note one particular feature of our translation. The author of the *Funerary Speech* is addicted to using complex and sometimes elephantine sentences in which, unlike John, who is his literary model, he sometimes loses control of the syntax. In these cases, we have marked the anacolouthon with a long dash and resumed our translation on a new line (as in §§ 6, 10, 12, 13, 17, 22).

In our translation of John's letters from exile we have silently corrected a few minor misprints in Montfaucon's edition (1721, 605–736) which were already corrected in Migne's reprint of 1859 (PG 52.635–748). We refer to John's letters either (1) by their number in Montfaucon's edition, which is retained by Migne, e.g., *Ep.* 196M; (2) by their number in our translated selection, e.g., *Letter VII B&B*; or (3) by both, e.g., *Letter VII* = 196M.

CHRONOLOGY OF JOHN'S LIFE AND POSTHUMOUS REHABILITATION

- c.349: Born in Antioch
- ?368: Baptized at Easter
- 372–78: Six years of monastic seclusion
- 380 or 381: Ordained deacon by Meletius, bishop of Antioch
- 386, 26 February: Ordained priest by Meletius' successor Flavianus
- 397, 27 September: Death of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople probably during November. On the advice of his chief minister Eutropius, the emperor Arcadius chooses John as the new bishop of Constantinople and orders him to be brought from Antioch
 - 15 December: John consecrated as bishop of Constantinople
- 399, 1 January: Eutropius becomes consul
 - spring: Rebellion of Tribigild
 - August: Fall of Eutropius
- 400, spring: Surrender of Aurelianus, Saturninus and the *comes* Johannes to Gainas
 - April: Gothic troops billeted in Constantinople
 - 12 July: Massacre of the Goths in Constantinople
- late 401 to 402, after Easter (6 April): John absent from Constantinople; in Ephesus he presides over a council of bishops of the province of Asia
- 403, summer: Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria, comes to Constantinople, where the Augusta Eudoxia provides him with lodging
 - ?September: John deposed by the Council of the Oak and escorted into exile
 - ?late September (possibly October): John recalled to Constantinople
- 404, night of 16–17 April: Riots in Constantinople; John writes to Innocentius, bishop of Rome
 - 9 June: John's enemies obtain an audience with the emperor Arcadius
 - 20 June: John sent into exile
 - 26 June: Arsacius elected bishop of Constantinople as John's successor
 - 30 September: Violent hailstorm in Constantinople and its suburbs
 - 6 October: Death of Eudoxia in childbirth

- 405, 11 November: Death of Arsacius
- 406, March: Consecration of Atticus as Arsacius' successor
- 407, 14 September: Death of John
 ?October: News of John's death reaches the vicinity of Constantinople;
 Cosmas delivers the *Funerary Speech*, presumably in a city near Constantinople
- early 408: After revision and expansion, the extant version of the *Funerary Speech* is circulated among John's supporters in Constantinople
 spring: Palladius composes his *Historical Dialogue on John* in exile in Egypt
- ?c.416: Alexander, the bishop of Antioch, restores John's name to the diptychs of the city, being the first bishop to do so
- ?c.417: Atticus restores John's name to the list of deceased bishops for whom the church of Constantinople regularly prays
- ?c.418: Cyril of Alexandria rehabilitates the memory of John in response to a letter from Atticus
- 425, 23 October: Death of Atticus
- 428, 14 September: The imperial court starts to celebrate the memory of John
- 438, 27 January: John's relics interred under the high altar of the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople
- before June 444: Cyril of Alexandria includes a quotation from John in a selection of proof texts in a treatise addressed to the Augustae Arcadia and Marina
- 451, October: In the florilegium of patristic texts which it attached to its address to the emperor Marcian, the Council of Chalcedon recognizes John as one of the authoritative teachers of correct Christian doctrine alongside Athanasius, Ambrose, Atticus and Proclus, the bishops of Constantinople, and Cyril of Alexandria

INTRODUCTION

1. THE LIFE, CAREER AND AFTERLIFE OF JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

John, who acquired the surname of Chrysostom ('Golden Mouth') long after his death, was born in 349 in the large, metropolitan city of Antioch on the Orontes in Syria (modern Antakya in south-eastern Turkey),¹ which had, at the time of his birth, been the main residence of the emperor Constantius and his court for more than a decade.² John's parents belonged to the better class in the city, and his father, Secundus, who died shortly after his birth, had served on the staff of the main military commander of the Roman army in the East.³ His widowed mother, Anthusa, who was a Christian, possessed sufficient wealth to pay for her son to receive an excellent traditional education in the Greek classics, including a period in the mid-360s as a pupil of Libanius, the holder of the official chair of Greek rhetoric in Antioch and a redoubtable champion of traditional Greek culture.⁴ But John turned his back on the legal and bureaucratic career for which his education had prepared him, received baptism before he turned twenty, and served 'for about three years' as a personal aide to Meletius, the bishop of Antioch, who appointed him to the lowest order of clergy as a reader or lector (*anagnōstēs* in Greek) before he departed into exile.⁵ In 371/372 an attempt was made to ordain John, but he left Antioch and spent the next few years as an ascetic,

1 Kelly 1995, 296–98; *Barrington Atlas*, Maps 1K3, 3C2, 67C.

2 Barnes 1993, 219–20. In the late summer or autumn of 350, however, Constantius left Antioch to combat the usurpation of Magnentius in Gaul, only returning a decade later, in the winter of 359/360 (Barnes 1993, 220–24).

3 Palladius, *Dial.* 5.1–4; Socrates, *HE* 6.3.1; cf. Jones 1953, 171; Kelly 1995, 4–5.

4 Socrates, *HE* 6.3.1; cf. Petit 1957, 41 n.129; Kelly 1995, 5–8. Socrates reports that John also attended the lectures of the philosopher Andragathius, who unfortunately seems to be otherwise unknown. Palladius, *Dial.* 5.1–5, plays down the importance of John's secular education, but reveals that John studied with Libanius, whom he does not name, until his eighteenth year.

5 Palladius, *Dial.* 5.5–15; cf. Jones 1953, 172–73; Kelly 1995, 16–35.

first in a community of Syrian monks in the mountains close to Antioch, then as a solitary in a cave for two more years ‘seeking a complete escape from the world’ before returning to Antioch shortly after Meletius had been reinstated as bishop of the city in the autumn of 378.⁶

After an interval, probably in the spring of 381, Meletius ordained John deacon, and in this capacity John at once began to write copiously in the service of the church.⁷ Five years later, on 26 February 386, John was ordained priest by Flavianus, who had replaced Meletius as bishop of Antioch after the latter died in the summer of 381 during the Council of Constantinople.⁸ John immediately began to preach both regularly and very frequently – a habit that he never abandoned until he was condemned at the Council of the Oak and exiled from Constantinople more than seventeen years later.⁹ John’s speeches, especially the series of sermons that he preached during Lent 387 after a serious riot in Antioch, soon established his reputation as the liveliest and most accomplished Greek orator since Demosthenes, who for seven centuries had been universally regarded as the supreme and unequalled master of Greek rhetoric.¹⁰ The event that was to transform John’s life, however, was the visit to Antioch of the eunuch Eutropius, the guardian of the emperor’s bedchamber (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*) and Arcadius’ chief minister, who came to Syria in 396 to organize resistance to the invading Huns, whom he subsequently defeated decisively in Asia Minor (in 397 or 398).¹¹ Eutropius met John and was impressed by his intellectual abilities.¹²

Nectarius, the bishop of Constantinople since 381, died on 27 September 397. He had discharged his episcopal office for sixteen years without causing offence to anyone, but his death produced a contested election. Theophilus,

6 Palladius, *Dial.* 5.16–33; cf. Kelly 1995, 36–37; Barnes 1997, 13–16.

7 Palladius, *Dial.* 5.34–38; Kelly 1995, 37–54.

8 *Syn. Eccl. Cpl.* 492.26–28 (translated in App. C).

9 Kelly 1995, 55–71.

10 Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria* both salutes Demosthenes as the pre-eminent and most perfect Greek orator (10.1.76, 2.24; 12.2.22, 10.23, 26) and consistently couples Demosthenes and Cicero as the supreme masters of Greek and Latin oratory (2.5.16; 4.1.66–68; 5.13.42, 11.26). The famous modern Hellenist Wilamowitz opined that John had a better claim to be compared to Demosthenes than the second-century sophist Aelius Aristides, who was much admired and imitated by Libanius (quoted by Bardenhewer 1923, 353 n.1).

11 The only ancient source for Eutropius’ successful campaign against the Huns is the ‘hostile and maliciously distorted’ account in Claudian, *In Eutropium* 1.234–86; cf. Cameron 1970, 125–26, 129, 132.

12 Palladius, *Dial.* 5.55–57.

the bishop of Alexandria, made strenuous efforts to secure the election of Isidore, a priest of Alexandria under him, whom he expected to be a pliant and subservient bishop of Constantinople, but Eutropius persuaded Arcadius to summon John from Antioch and install him as Nectarius' successor.¹³ The *comes Orientis* Asterius was instructed to send John, who was already known by repute in the capital as an outstanding preacher, exegete of holy scripture and teacher, and as a staunch supporter of Nicene orthodoxy,¹⁴ under escort to Constantinople, where a council of prominent eastern bishops met, elected and consecrated John (on 15 December 397) and thus provided ecclesiastical and canonical ratification of his appointment.¹⁵ Theophilus of Alexandria was one of their number: it is alleged that, although he was angry that his candidate, Isidore, had been rejected, Eutropius blackmailed him into acquiescing to John's appointment.¹⁶ Hence John began his tenure of the see of Constantinople with the powerful bishop of Alexandria as his enemy, though with the support of the emperor Arcadius and his consort Eudoxia.¹⁷ Within six years, however, John had alienated Eudoxia,¹⁸ who had the ear of her husband, and in the late summer of 403 John was condemned and deposed by the so-called Council of the Oak and bundled into exile.¹⁹ Though he was recalled almost immediately, John was exiled again in June 404, this time permanently. He was sent to Cucusus in the rough countryside of eastern Asia Minor with its harsh winters, to a place where Isaurian raids were a constant danger. After a year in Cucusus, John was transferred to Arabissos, a fortress almost 60 km distant, where the inhabitants of Cucusus took refuge in the winter of 405–06 in an attempt to escape famine, plague and attacks by the Isaurians.²⁰ It seems probable that in the summer of 406 John returned to Cucusus, where he attracted many visitors from Antioch, the rest of Syria and Cilicia, who came to see

13 Socrates, *HE* 6.2.2–4; Theodoret, *HE* 5.27.1; Sozomen, *HE* 8.2.1, 13; cf. Kelly 1995, 104–06; Tiersch 2002a, 31–41.

14 Liebeschuetz 1990, 166; Kelly 1995, 105.

15 On the date, see App. C.

16 Socrates, *HE* 6.2.10.

17 Baynes, 1955, 104–105.

18 See below, section 8.3.

19 See §§ 52–59 with our notes. Photius' summary of the proceedings of the Council of the Oak is translated in App. A; the exact date of the synod is nowhere recorded, but the traditional date of September 403 must be approximately correct (Stilting 1868, 591, 708).

20 John, *Letter to Olympias* 15; *Ep.* 127; Palladius, *Dial.* 11.63–74. In the last of his *Letters to Olympias* John refers back to what he had suffered 'after my arrival here [that is, in Cucusus in 404], after my departure from Cucusus and after my stay in Arabissos' (*Ep.* 17.4a).

one whom they regarded as a holy man.²¹ In the following year, however, because Cucusus was becoming a place of pilgrimage, Arcadius ordered that John be deported to Pityus, a Roman military outpost on the north-eastern coast of the Black Sea.²² Soldiers were sent to escort John to a port on the southern coast of the Black Sea for embarkation on a ship which would take him to his new, utterly remote place of exile. During this march, on which he was forced to travel on foot despite his evident infirmity, John collapsed just north of the city of Comana Pontica,²³ to which he was then taken. He died within a few hours on 14 September 407 and his body was immediately laid to rest in the martyr church of Basiliscus.²⁴

Despite his death in exile and disgrace, over the course of time John became one of the most revered of Christian saints, especially in the Greek Orthodox Church. His posthumous rehabilitation began about nine years after his death when Alexander, the bishop of Antioch, restored John's name to the diptychs of the church there, from which they had been removed.²⁵ Shortly thereafter Atticus, who was bishop of Constantinople from March 406 to 25 October 423, restored John's name to the list of deceased bishops of the city for whom the Church of Constantinople regularly prayed.²⁶ Atticus then wrote to Cyril, who had succeeded John's enemy Theophilus as bishop of Alexandria in 412, and persuaded Cyril too to rehabilitate John's memory.²⁷ About a decade later, in September 428, the imperial court began to celebrate John's memory, doubtless on the anniversary of his death.²⁸

21 Palladius, *Dial.* 11.150–153; Sozomen, *HE* 8.27.8–9; cf. Kelly 1995, 260.

22 For the location of Pityus, see *Barrington Atlas*, Map 87F1.

23 *Barrington Atlas*, Map 87K4.

24 Palladius, *Dial.* 11.75–156; Sozomen, *HE* 8.28.2; cf. Kelly 1995, 282–83. For the date, Socrates, *HE* 6.21.1; *Syn. Eccl. Cpl.* 46.8–16 (translated in App. C). Palladius supplies details of John's last journey of which the author of the *Speech* was unaware (§ 136).

25 Theodoret, *HE* 5.35.5; cf. Rapp 2001, 281–82. Alexander was bishop of Antioch between Porphyrius and Theodotus (Theodoret, *HE* 5.35.2, 38.1), but no ancient evidence attests either the precise dates or even the approximate length of his tenure of the see (Devreesse 1945, 42, 127).

26 Socrates, *HE* 7.25.2; Theophanes, a. 5912, p.83.35–84.2 de Boor.

27 Cyril, *Epp.* 75 (CPG 5652; *BHG, Auct.*, p. 95 no. 873kb: Atticus' letter); 76 (CPG 5376). The dates at which the bishops of Antioch, Constantinople and Alexandria restored John's memory are not precisely attested; we have adopted a slightly later chronology (?416–?418) than the recent translator of Cyril's letters, who dates Atticus' letter 'about 412–415' and Cyril's reply 'about 415' (McEnerney 1985, 2.83, 86).

28 Marcellinus states that in 428 'The memory of the most blessed bishop John, who had long before been exiled through the jealousy of evil bishops, began to be celebrated at the imperial court on the 26th day of the month of September' (*Chr. min.* 2.77: *Beatissimi Iohannis*

Nearly ten years later, on 27 January 438, John's relics were transported back to Constantinople, and solemnly interred under the high altar of the Church of the Apostles.²⁹ John's memory was now fully restored and he took his place among the doctors of the church. Hence, when Cyril of Alexandria, who had attended the Council of the Oak in 403 and assented to John's condemnation and deposition,³⁰ addressed a theological treatise to Arcadia and Marina, the sisters of the emperor Theodosius, he included a quotation from John in his selection of proof texts.³¹ Finally, in October 451, when the Council of Chalcedon submitted to the emperor Marcian a formal justification of the creed which it had adopted, it attached a florilegium of patristic texts which included John as one of the authoritative teachers of correct Christian doctrine alongside Athanasius of Alexandria, Ambrose of Milan, Atticus and Proclus who had successively occupied the see of Constantinople from 434 to 446, and Cyril himself.³²

2. THE SPEECH

The text translated here is the revised version of a speech which a follower of John delivered, presumably in a city in the north-western corner of Asia Minor not far from Constantinople, perhaps Nicaea or Nicomedia, very shortly after news arrived of John's death on 14 September 407 in faraway Comana. Like most of the Greek and Latin speeches from antiquity which

episcopi, dudum malorum episcoporum invidia exsulati, apud comitatum coepit memoria celebrari mense Septembrio die XXVI). Croke 2001, 203–04, convincingly argues that the transmitted XXVI should be emended to XIV, since the Church of Constantinople used to celebrate John's memory on 14 September, which was the day on which he died (Socrates, *HE* 6.21.1), until the celebration was moved to 13 November to avoid a clash with the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (*Syn. Eccl. Cpl.* 47.6–18, 217.39–42; cf. Kotter 1988, 351).

29 Socrates, *HE* 7.45.2; Theodoret, *HE* 5.36.1–2; Marcellinus 438.2; *Synax. Eccl. Cpl.* 425–26. Photius preserves summaries of and extracts from the five speeches which Theodoret delivered on this occasion; we have translated them in App. B.

30 In a letter written almost thirty years later (*CPG* 5333 = *ACO* 1.1.7.147 [Greek]; *ACO* 1.4.94–98 [Latin]), Cyril reminded Acacius of Beroea, who had been one of the three bishops presiding over the Council of the Oak (§§ 45, 102, 108), that he had attended the council and he quoted verbatim from a statement which Acacius made to the council (*Ep.* 33.7).

31 *CPG* 5219: *ACO* 1.1.5.62–118 (*Collectio Vaticana* 150). Cyril, *ACO* 1.1.5.67 lines 14–24, quotes from John, *In natalem Christi diem* (*CPG* 4560: *PG* 56.385–94, at 385, 389). The date must be earlier than June 444 when Cyril died, probably on 27 June (E.R. Hardy, *Theologische Realencyclopädie* 8 [1981], 256).

32 *ACO* 2.1.3, 114–16 [473–75] = 2.3.3, 119–22 [558–61], nos. 9, 16.

have been transmitted to the modern world, the speech that survives is a revised and expanded version of an original speech delivered orally, which the author subsequently prepared for publication. He presumably put his final text into circulation during the winter of 407/408, since the revised version of the speech makes no allusion whatever to any event later than the arrival in the vicinity of Constantinople of soldiers who reported John's death.

The *Funerary Speech* is not in any sense a 'life' of John Chrysostom, nor is it entirely appropriate to style it 'a panegyric which touches on several key episodes in John's career'.³³ The speech is of course panegyric in intent, content and style, as its author makes clear in his introduction (§ 5) and in several other passages where he either calls his speech an encomium or compares it with other encomia (§§ 28, 51, 59, 132). But he defines the speech as something much more specific in his exordium. It is the substitute for a speech which ought to have been delivered at John's funeral (§ 1), but which is instead being delivered on receipt of news of his death – news which the author hopes may turn out to be false (§ 136). Accordingly, since the original title has not been preserved, we have entitled it 'Funerary Speech for Bishop John'. Originally delivered by one of his followers before an audience of other Johannites³⁴ very shortly after news of the deposed bishop's death reached the environs of Constantinople, the *Funerary Speech* is the earliest surviving literary account of the activities of John Chrysostom as bishop of Constantinople and of his deposition, exiles and death.

3. THE AUTHOR

John's homilies provided the literary model for the author of the *Funerary Speech*, who thanks John at the outset for giving him 'the ability to speak' (§ 1). Hence the thought, language and style of the speech reflect those of its author's acknowledged master and mentor in a variety of ways. Most obviously, the *Funerary Speech* uses words, phrases and turns of phrase which are either only attested earlier in extant Greek prose in John himself or were favoured and used frequently by John: we have documented clear and sometimes significant examples of verbal imitation of John in the notes to our translation (§§ 10, 12, 17, 18, 20, 35, 39, 51, 107, 111, 113, 121,

³³ Kelly 1995, 291.

³⁴ For the term 'Johannites' applied to supporters of John, see Socrates, *HE* 6.18.49, 52; 7.25.6; Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.4; Theophanes p.83.35 de Boor.

130), but we suspect that there are probably many other examples which we have not detected, since neither of us is well versed in John's abundant literary *œuvre*.

In addition to such close verbal copying of John, the speech frequently employs athletic vocabulary and metaphors, as John had: a study from the 1920s not only set out what its author called 'a logical classification of the athletic metaphors' in John's biblical homilies, but argued that athletic contests 'held as strong a fascination for the average person' in John's day as they did in the United States of that time³⁵ – an observation even more apposite over a wider geographical range in the twenty-first century. Significantly, the *Funerary Speech* sometimes illustrates John's situation by using extended athletic similes (§§ 22, 29–30).

The author of the *Funerary Speech* undoubtedly had elevated stylistic aspirations and pretensions. One clear sign of this is his relatively frequent use of the optative mood of verbs. The optative mood had come close to disappearing in ordinary spoken Greek in the Hellenistic period (*koine*) except in wishes and imprecations, although it continued to be used in literary texts.³⁶ In the second century, however, the Atticism preached by the so-called Second Sophistic movement produced a resurgence of the optative as one of the obligatory reversions to classic Attic diction of the fifth and fourth centuries BC, first among literary authors, then more generally among the literate classes as a whole.³⁷ Christian writers with a rhetorical training such as Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus and John himself naturally followed the general linguistic trend and used the optative mood frequently in both main and subordinate clauses.³⁸ So too does the author of the *Funerary Speech*, who uses the optative about forty times, not only in an indirect question (§ 45.4), in both the protasis of conditional sentences (§§ 28.5–6, 60.16, 61.4, 62.20, 71.8, 99.7) and in main clauses which express an unfulfilled or future possibility (§§ 1.10, 2.13, 7.3, 10.12, 15.9, 16.9, 23.4, 36.10, 36.12, 59.13, 62.8, 128.4, 130.16: always with ἄν), and in illustrative examples (§§ 23.13–16, 24.9–11, 29. 5–10),³⁹ but also in final clauses expressing purpose (§§ 24.1, 24.25, 47.6–7, 53.4, 56.5–6, 79.16, 93.7) and to add the notion of indefiniteness ('whoever / whatever / however'

35 Sawhill 1928, esp. 9, 110, 113–16; cf. Barnes 2001, 341–45.

36 Moulton and Turner 1963, 118–23.

37 Harsing 1910, 32–33, 57.

38 See, respectively, Hoey 1930; Henry 1943; Dickinson 1926.

39 In § 29.10 we suspect that the indicative ποιεῖ should be emended to the optative ποιοί, since it follows four preceding optatives.

and ‘whenever’) in both relative (§§ 48.8, 63.15, 123.7, 124.5, 136.3) and temporal clauses (§61.18).

Although the speech uses many of the familiar rhetorical devices of the so-called Second Sophistic movement, as had Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa and John himself,⁴⁰ its author does not use them habitually and instinctively, as his model John had. Detailed studies of the profound influence of stylistic devices characteristic of the Second Sophistic movement on the panegyric orations of John and the sermons of Basil have documented their frequent use of anaphora, hyperbaton, hendiadys, homoioteleuton, paradox and oxymoron, hyperbole, antonomasia, antimetathesis (the repetition of a word in the same sentence with a different meaning) and Gorgianic figures such as symmetry between cola and between sentences, metaphor, comparison and ecphrasis.⁴¹ In contrast, the *Funerary Speech* employs these devices only sparingly and intermittently. Moreover, it consistently falls far short of the literary virtuosity which John instinctively displays, especially in elephantine sentences which develop similes at inordinate and often irrelevant length – and in which the initial grammatical construction sometimes falters or even breaks down.⁴² In short, although the author of the *Funerary Speech* attempts to write artistic prose, *Kunstprosa* as defined by Eduard Norden and practised by sophisticated literary artists like Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea and John himself,⁴³ he conspicuously fails in the attempt. Hence we reject Martin Wallraff’s identification of the author of the *Funerary Speech* as Philip of Side, who was a known follower of John, a relative of the famous sophist Troilus, who also hailed from Side, and the author of a lost ecclesiastical history in 36 books.⁴⁴ Instead we tentatively identify him with the Cosmas

40 See, respectively, Campbell 1922 (Basil); Guignet 1911; Ruether 1969, 55–128 (Gregory of Nazianzus); Méridier 1906 (Gregory of Nyssa); Ameringer 1921; Burns 1930, 54–116 (John).

41 Ameringer 1921, 29–100; Campbell 1922, 65–145.

42 As in §§ 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 22, 24, 26, 61.

43 Norden 1909, 562–72.

44 CPG 6026; cf. Wallraff 2005, 47–49; Heyden 2006; Wallraff 2007, 16–17. Socrates, *HE* 7.27.1, records Philip’s relationship to Troilus, on whom see *PLRE* 2.1128. Troilus was close to Anthemius (*PLRE* 2.93–95, Anthemius 1), who as *magister officiorum* cooperated with Antiochus, Severianus and Acacius against the interests of John at Easter 404 according to Palladius, *Dial.* 9.166–207. John wrote from exile congratulating Anthemius on his appointment as praetorian prefect of the East and his consulate in 405 (*Letter XVIII B&B*), but that need not imply that he was ‘un ami de Jean’ (Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 196 n.2) or even that the exiled John regarded him as such.

who is named as a contemporary of John in a tenth century list of authors who had written about John.

4. A BYZANTINE LIST OF WRITERS ABOUT JOHN

In the final volume of the Eton edition of John Chrysostom Sir Henry Savile published a list of ‘those who have written about the life of the Golden Mouth’.⁴⁵ Savile described the list as ‘copied at Padua from a very old manuscript belonging to Michael Sophiano’: in fact, he printed it from the first folio of a manuscript written by Sophiano in 1557, which was then and still is in Vienna (Vindobonensis Historicus Graecus 52). Sophiano had transcribed it in Padua from a twelfth-century manuscript now in Munich (Codex Monacensis Graecus 108, fol. 6^v).⁴⁶ The list was drawn up in the late tenth century by an anonymous author who prefixed it to his lengthy *Life of John*, which was the main source of the later metaphrastic *Life of John*, both of which Savile edited.⁴⁷ This list, though in fact incomplete, presumably contains all the accounts of the life of John known to its compiler in the later tenth century.⁴⁸ We translate here the list as printed by Savile, including the numeral prefixed to each entry, and, wherever we can, we identify the work or works to which the list refers or appears to refer, whether still extant or otherwise known only from later reports.

<List of> those who have written about the life of the Golden Mouth

1 First, Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian⁴⁹

2 Next Palladius, the bishop of Helenopolis⁵⁰

3 Then Saint Proclus of Constantinople⁵¹

45 Savile 1613, 293; for later editions of the list, see *BHG* 881a. The fullest discussion appears to be that in a volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* originally published in 1753 (Stilting 1868, 406–08).

46 Ehrhard 1952, 955 n.2, 1016–17 n.1.

47 Savile 1613, 294–371 (*BHG* 876); Savile 1613, 373–428 (*BHG* 875); also *PG* 114.1045–1209; cf. Baur 1907, 47–48.

48 For the abundant hagiography of John, see *BHG* 870–81z; *Auctarium*, pp. 94–100. The most conspicuous omission from the list is the work of Theodorus of Trimithous in Cyprus (*BHG* 872bd = *CPG* 7989; *PG* 47.li–lxxxviii, re-edited by Halkin 1977, 8–68: nos. I, II).

49 On Socrates’ *Ecclesiastical History*, see below section 7.8.

50 On Palladius’ *Historical Dialogue on John*, see below section 7.6.

51 The original Greek of Proclus’ *Homily* 20: *In s. Iohannem Chrysostomum* (*CPG* 5819) is lost, but translations into Latin, Armenian and Old Church Slavonic survive (Leroy 1967, 134–35, 151–52; Halkin 1975).

- 4 After these, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, after that vision which he saw concerning him.⁵² Finding his pages after many years
- 5 George the Patriarch (πάπας) of Alexandria, completed his extensive book, also collecting together the labours of other writers⁵³
- 6 After this, Sophronius, Patriarch (πατριάρχης) of Jerusalem⁵⁴
- 7 John of Damascus⁵⁵
- 8 Martyrius, Patriarch (πατριάρχης) of Antioch
- 9 Cosmas a deacon of the Church of the Apostles (διάκονος ἀποστολιτῶν)⁵⁶ in the time of the Golden Mouth
- 10 Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus⁵⁷
- 11 Nilus the Great, i.e., Nilus of Ancyra
- 12 Isidore of Pelusium⁵⁸

52 For other reports of Cyril's vision, see Halkin 1976, 21; Ommeslaeghe 1976, 354 (*BHG* 874h §§ 66–67). Cyril is not in fact known to have written about the life of John.

53 *BHG* 873bd = *CPG* 7979 + *Supp.*; Savile 1613, 157–265; Halkin 1977, 70–285. The *Life of John* attributed to George, who was bishop of Alexandria from c.620 to c.630, survives entire in Greek, and versions are known in Georgian, Arabic, Old Church Slavonic and Palaeo-Russian. The editions by Savile and Halkin are both based on only two out of some thirty known manuscripts, but each of them based his edition on a different pair. It has been argued that the attribution of this *Life of John* to George is erroneous because George depends on Theodorus of Trimithous, who was writing c.680 (Norton 1925; Baur 1960, xxxiii–xxxv; Katos 2011, 33). But it may be Theodorus who depends on George and not vice versa (Baur 1927), and the issue need not be resolved here (cf. Beck 1959, 460, 463).

54 Sophronius was bishop of Jerusalem in the seventh century (634–38); works survive in several genres including homilies, poems and hymns, and encomia on saints (*CPG* 7635–55). There are fragments of an encomium on John the Evangelist (*BHG* 925 = *CPG* 7648: *PG* 87.3.3364), but nothing on John Chrysostom is registered in the standard list of Sophronius' writings, not even among the works doubtfully or wrongly attributed to him (*CPG* 7656–81).

55 *BHG* 879 = *CPG* 8064; Stilling 1868, 700–09; *PG* 96.761–81; Kotter 1988, 353–70. John lived from c.675 to c.754 (A.P. Kazhdan, *ODB* 2:1063–64).

56 On the meaning of ἀποστολιτῶν (mistranslated by Barnes 2001, 334), see Trapp 2001, 180. The emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos used the plural noun ἀποστολιτῶν eight times in his handbook *On Ceremonies* to distinguish the cantors of the Church of the Holy Apostles from those of the Church of Hagia Sophia.

57 This is not a reference to Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*, but to the encomia on John which he delivered in Constantinople in January 438; the brief extracts preserved from these by Photius are translated in App. B.

58 Both Nilus and Isidore are counted among the panegyrists by Baur 1959, xxi, but no such separate entry is to be found for either writer in *CPG* 5557–58, 6043–84. With Baur (1907, 4–5), we consider it more likely that Nilus and Isidore are included in this list on the strength of favourable references to John in letters which they wrote before John's relics were taken to Constantinople in 438: Nilus, *Ep.* 183 (*PG* 79.296); Isidore, *Ep.* 4.225 (*PG* 78.1317–20); cf. 1.156; 2.42.

- We, therefore, having collected the most timely and best of all these,
whose authors were unaware of one another,
have put together the present composition for those who love God,
to the glory of God and the remembrance of the Saint.

59 This Evagrius can hardly be the monastic writer Evagrius Ponticus, who composed ascetical works, since he died in 399 (B. Baldwin and A. Kazhdan, *ODB* 2:760). The only other identification that offers itself is with the monk Evagrius who composed a *Martyrdom of Pancratius*, the supposed first-century bishop of Tauromenium in Sicily, apparently during the iconoclastic controversy (Beck 1959, 513).

61 *BHG* 880; Savile 1613, 267–90, whence *PG* 107.228–92. The emperor Leo VI, who was born on 19 September 866 and died on 11 May 912, was ‘an educated man who dabbled in literature’ (A. Kazhdan and A. Cutler, *ODB* 2:1210–11).

63 BHG 881c. On the literary productions of Leo and of Nicetas the *skeuophylax* and Nicetas the Paphlagonian, whose lives overlapped with that of Leo, see briefly Beck 1959, 546–48.

65 Basil must be the monk Basil who wrote a life of the Georgian saint Hilarion in the reign of the emperor Basil I (867–86), which survives only in a Georgian translation (not registered in the Bollandist *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis*, published in 1911). In the colophon of this life the monk Basil describes himself, in Paul Peeters' Latin translation, as *primus a secretis*, that is *πρωτοσχηματῆς*, and a philosopher (Peeters 1913, 238, 269).

18/03/2013 12:12

is described as a contemporary of John.⁶⁷ But there seems to be an obvious obstacle to this identification. The Cosmas of the list is described as a deacon of the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople whereas the author of the *Funerary Speech* was a priest (§ 1, 10).⁶⁸ That need not, however, preclude identification. Cosmas could have been a deacon of the Church of the Apostles under John before John was condemned and deposed at the Council of the Oak in autumn 403, who was then ordained priest by John when he resumed his episcopal duties as bishop of Constantinople between his return from his first brief exile and his final expulsion from the imperial capital in June 404. If this was the case, then John's ecclesiastical opponents would certainly have denied the validity of Cosmas' ordination as a priest, so that the official view of the Church of Constantinople after John's memory was rehabilitated would have been that Cosmas had never risen above the rank of deacon. Moreover, it seems certain that a text of the *Funerary Speech* was available in Constantinople in the 440s and accepted as a valuable document, since the orthodox ecclesiastical historian Sozomen used it to supplement the account of John in Constantinople given by his predecessor Socrates, who was the principal source of his narrative for events in Constantinople.⁶⁹

5. MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS OF THE SPEECH

The first complete modern text of the *Funerary Speech* was produced in 1974 by Florent van Ommeslaeghe (1924–94), whose doctoral dissertation for the Catholic University of Leuven comprised a text based on manuscripts P and M together with a Flemish translation and notes.⁷⁰ But the first proper

67 The identification was proposed by Barnes 2001, 334. It is rejected by Wallraff, who proposes instead to identify the author as Philip of Side on the grounds that Philip fits the literary profile of the author of the *Funerary Speech* as he defines it (Wallraff 2005, 47–49; 2007, 16–17). For stylistic objections to this hypothesis, see above section 3.

68 Wallraff 2007, 15–16.

69 For proof that Sozomen used the *Funerary Speech*, not vice versa, see Wallraff 2007, 18–19.

70 Ommeslaeghe 1974. Although van Ommeslaeghe's thesis was never formally published, photographic copies could be obtained from the library of the Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven. Ommeslaeghe left his projected edition for the Bollandists not only unfinished, but hardly even begun – despite an entry that reads 'Van Ommeslaeghe, F. (1989). (ed.) *L'oraison funèbre de S. Jean Chrysostome attribuée à Martyrius d'Antioche* (= *Subsidia Hagiographica*, 71), Bruxelles' in the bibliography in Liebeschuetz 1990, 301. In his biography of John, Kelly

critical edition, which may or may not deserve to be called the *editio princeps*, was published in 2007 by Martin Wallraff with an introduction and notes in Italian and an Italian translation by Cristina Ricci. The speech is preserved in five Greek manuscripts, only three of which are complete. They are listed and described by Wallraff:⁷¹

- K Athos, Koutloumousiou 13, of the tenth century
- L Athos, Megiste Lavra B 119, of the eleventh century
- P Parisinus Graecus 1519, of the eleventh century, pages 453–535
- M Venice, Marcianus Graecus VII, 34, of the tenth century, fols. 211^v–242^v (§§ 1–84.2, 87.7–110.2)
- V Vaticanus graecus 633, of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, fols. 72^v–6^v (§§ 133–144.2).

Indirect testimony to the text is provided by a life of John (assigned the number *BHG* 874h), which Florent van Ommeslaeghe edited from Athos, Vatopedi 73 (tenth century), fols. 1–29.⁷²

Wallraff analysed the relationship between the five manuscripts, which he depicted in a bipartite stemma in which all manuscripts derive from the same archetype, K and L derive from one hyparchetype, M and P from another, while V appears to derive from L. Manuscripts K, L, M and V all identify the speech as an encomium of John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, by Martyrius, bishop of Antioch, while P, which is a menologium for the first half of the month of November, calls it a ‘metaphrasis by Symeon, *magister* and *logothete*’ which comprises an ‘encomium on the life of our father among the saints and illuminator of the world, John the Golden Mouth’. Neither Symeon the Logothete nor Martyrius can possibly be the author of a speech delivered in the autumn of 407 and completed in the following winter, for Symeon flourished in the mid-tenth century,⁷³ while Martyrius’ tenure of the see of Antioch commenced in 458 or 459, was interrupted briefly in the mid-460s and ended prematurely in violence in 470.⁷⁴ Moreover, the speech itself indicates that it was delivered by a

1995 made no direct use either of Ommeslaeghe’s edition of the text or of the Paris manuscript on which it was based, even though a microfilm was readily available on request.

71 Wallraff 2007: the introduction and critical text (pages 40–200, even numbers) are due to Wallraff; Ricci’s Italian translation, which we have constantly consulted, is printed *en face* (pages 41–201). We refer to Wallraff’s text and to Ricci’s translation and discussion of specific passages with their names only; to Wallraff’s introduction as Wallraff 2007, 1–37.

72 Ommeslaeghe 1976, 326–55.

73 A. Kazhdan, *ODB* 3:1982–83.

74 Devreesse 1945, 117–18 nos. 44, 49; Frend 1972, 167, 175.

follower of John to an audience of Johannites in a city near to Constantinople almost immediately after news of the exiled bishop's death at Comana on 14 September 407 reached them. Hence, given that it is not known how the speech came to be attributed to Martyrius, we reject the conventional designation of the author as 'Pseudo-Martyrius' as misleading, since there is no good evidence that the author claimed to be called Martyrius. The prefix 'pseudo-' is only appropriate in cases where such a claim is made, as by Pseudo-Pionius or Pseudo-Methodius.

6. THE SPEECH IN MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

Cardinal Angelo Mai printed the last chapters of the speech from the Vatican manuscript (V) in 1844, and Migne subsequently reprinted Mai's text.⁷⁵ In 1907, in his survey of the literary sources for the life of John, Chrysostomus Baur (1876–1962) identified this excerpt as part of what he called a 'Panégyrique de Martyrius (évêque d'Antioche)', which he dated to the end of 407 or the beginning of 408 and which he held was both contemporaneous with Palladius' *Dialogue* and of equal value to it as a historical source for John.⁷⁶ Baur subsequently worked on a critical edition of the whole text, at that time known only from the excerpt in V, the manuscript in Paris (P), which preserves it under the title 'Simeonis Metaphrastae oratio in laudem S. Joannis Chrysostomi',⁷⁷ and a manuscript in Venice (M), which contains most of the text and had been described briefly by Delehaye.⁷⁸

Baur transcribed P and collated M and L and long continued to promise that his edition of what he called 'the earliest real biography of John' would soon appear.⁷⁹ Yet within a few years of 1907 Baur had begun to have doubts about his optimistic assessment of the date and historical value of the text. He made no mention of the *Funerary Speech* at all in the brief biography of John which he published in 1915 as an introduction to his German translation of John's *Commentary on Matthew* in four volumes,⁸⁰ and by the time that he composed his large study of 'Saint John Chrysostom and his Age'

75 A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* 2 (Rome, 1844), 546–51, whence PG 47.xliii–lii.

76 Baur 1907, 39.

77 Omont 1888, 76. Halkin 1968, 195, adds the gloss 'sic pro Martyrio' and mistakenly calls the speech a 'life'.

78 Delehaye 1905, 236 no. 5.

79 Baur 1929, xix.

80 Baur 1915, i–xxxv.

he had come to believe that the speech (which he now called a 'life') was by no means a primary or contemporary document. In his list of sources for the life of John, Baur relegated the *Funerary Speech* to the category of Byzantine biographies of the seventh to eleventh centuries.⁸¹ Its author, he argued, knew not only Palladius' *Dialogue*, but also the *Ecclesiastical History* of Sozomen, and probably also drew on speeches by Proclus and Theodoret delivered in 438. Although Baur considered that the manuscript attribution to Martyrius, who became bishop of Antioch shortly before 460, could theoretically be possible on chronological grounds, he pronounced it remarkable that someone writing in Antioch at that time did not have better knowledge about the events which he describes. On these mistaken premises, Baur opted for a date long after the death of Martyrius and declared that he could find no convincing *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the work. Baur reaffirmed this negative verdict in the second edition of his study, which was published in an English translation thirty years after the first: here he asserted that 'the apparent indications of contemporaneity with Chrysostom rest entirely on a literary fiction' and he dismissed 'the historical value of the source' as virtually non-existent.⁸² It is to van Ommeslaeghe that we owe the proof of a very early date for the *Funerary Speech* and a correct appreciation of its high historical value. Although he never completed the full critical edition of the *Speech* on which he worked after he became a Bollandist in 1977, he published a series of preliminary articles which established both its date and its importance as a historical source.⁸³ Nevertheless, no mention whatever is made of the speech in a recent study of John's preaching in Constantinople.⁸⁴

7. OTHER EARLY SOURCES FOR JOHN IN CONSTANTINOPLE AND HIS EXILE

Almost all who have written about John since the discovery of the *Funerary Speech* have made substantial use of the *Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza*, allegedly written by his companion Mark the Deacon, as eye-witness evidence

81 Baur 1929, xi–xxvii, esp. xix–xx. Baur was followed by Beck 1959, 463, who in his survey of Byzantine theological literature opined that 'the legendary features are not few in number, so that one may very well cautiously relegate the Life to the seventh century'.

82 Baur 1959, xxxii–xxxiii.

83 Ommeslaeghe 1975; 1976; 1977; 1979; 1981; 1992.

84 Hartney 2004.

for the activities of John in Constantinople.⁸⁵ But this is a thoroughly fictitious composition which was composed in the sixth century and its alleged author probably never existed.⁸⁶ The early sources, in addition to John's own letters from exile, which we regularly quote in the notes to our translation for John's tenure of the see of Constantinople, his deposition and his exile, are the following, which we list in chronological order.

7.1 Homilies delivered by John in Constantinople

Some of the many sermons which John delivered during his tenure of the see of Constantinople are relevant to events and episodes which the *Funerary Speech* describes or to which it alludes, but they do not often help to clarify specific passages (for an exception, see our notes on § 31). A group of four homilies, however, has an especial relevance to the period between John's deposition by the Council of the Oak and his resumption of his duties as bishop of Constantinople in the winter of 403/404; however, already in the eighteenth century John's great Benedictine editor, Bernard de Montfaucon, had raised problems of authenticity concerning three of them. The textual transmission and authenticity of these four homilies have been carefully investigated in a recent Oxford doctoral thesis by Emilio Bonfiglio, whose findings we have adopted.⁸⁷ The four homilies in question are as follows.

(A) *Sermo antequam iret in exsilium*.⁸⁸ Of the homily's five chapters in standard editions of John only the first three are by John himself. The last two chapters do not appear in the early Latin version apparently made by Anianus of Celeda about a dozen years after John's death:⁸⁹ therefore, they were not in the Greek text which Anianus used, and they were rightly condemned as inauthentic by Montfaucon, who accepted the first three chapters as 'not unworthy of Chrysostom' and hence authentic.⁹⁰

85 BHG 1470 = CPG 6722; see, for example, Baur, 1907, 38–40; 1929, xvi; 1930, 145–54; 1959, xxvii–xxviii; 1960, 169–79; Ommeslaeghe 1979, 135; Kelly 1995, 142, 168–70, 172–74; Tiersch 2002a, 207, 224–25; Liebeschuetz 2011, 225–27, 232–33. To his credit, however, Baur stated that the *Life of Porphyry* had 'brought such confusion into the life of St. Chrysostom that those who know [John] have tried in vain to find a way out of the chronological labyrinth' that it creates, and that it 'loses in authority and reliability' when measured against the undoubtedly contemporary Palladius (1930, 155–60; 1960, 179–85).

86 Barnes 2010, 260–83.

87 Bonfiglio 2011.

88 CPG 4396: PG 52. 427*–32.

89 PG 52.431–36; cf. Honigsmann 1953, 54–58. On the importance of Anianus as a witness to the text of John's homilies, see Bonfiglio 2010.

90 Montfaucon 1721, 414, reprinted by Migne, PG 52.427*–28*.

(B) *Sermo cum iret in exilium*.⁹¹ Montfaucon argued long ago that this homily is either completely inauthentic or deeply corrupt and heavily interpolated.⁹² Its opening echoes John's vocabulary, but it replaces John's normal clarity with portentous obscurity, for example in its exordium, where it is unclear what feast, festival or holy day is meant by the phrase 'fine festival day' (λαμπρὰ πανήγυρις: a collocation of words unique in the whole of Greek literature).⁹³ The textual evidence for the homily is confused. There are, on the one hand, only two independent Greek manuscripts and, on the other hand, translations into both Syriac and Armenian, which have so far only been edited in an unpublished doctoral thesis. But, while the Syriac and Armenian translations agree closely with each other, they differ substantially from the Greek version, which they do not render in a straightforward manner, but rearrange.⁹⁴ No Greek original of this version has been found, though one presumably once existed. Hence the *onus probandi* now rests very heavily on any scholar who wishes to use either version of the homily as evidence for what John said in 403.

(C) *Post reditum a priore exilio*.⁹⁵ This homily is transmitted in two independent Greek manuscripts, an unpublished Armenian version and the early Latin translation by Anianus of Celeda.⁹⁶ This seems to guarantee that the attribution to John himself is correct and there is nothing in the text that counts against its complete authenticity.

(D) *Post reditum a priore exilio II*.⁹⁷ This homily, which Sozomen states that John left half finished because he had inflamed his audience,⁹⁸ purports to have been delivered by John in 403 after he had been summoned back from exile by Arcadius after Eudoxia's miscarriage (§§ 66–67). Montfaucon long ago detected an anachronism in the text: since the complaint that 'the baptistery has been filled with blood' alludes to an event which occurred at Easter 404 (§§ 93–95), John could not have uttered these words in 403.⁹⁹ More recently, Baur opined that the homily could not be genuine, at least in its present form.¹⁰⁰ The *Funerary Speech*, however, has removed this

91 CPG 4397: PG 52.435*–38.

92 Montfaucon 1721, 421, reprinted by Migne, PG 52.435*–36*.

93 PG 52.435*.

94 Bonfiglio 2011.

95 CPG 4398: PG 52.439–42.

96 On Anianus and the importance of his translations of John, see Bonfiglio 2010.

97 CPG 4399: PG 52.443–48.

98 Sozomen, HE 8.18.8.

99 PG 52.444; cf. Montfaucon 1721, 424, reprinted in PG 52.437–38.

100 Baur 1929, 230 n.27.

apparently decisive argument since it speaks of the place of baptism being defiled by the blood of those killed in a violence shortly before John's recall from exile (§ 79).¹⁰¹ On the other hand, neither Montfaucon nor Baur could avail themselves of a strong linguistic argument which the electronic *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* now provides. Although John used the Greek nouns *baptisma* and *phōtisma* for baptism more than 500 times and 18 times respectively, he never once used either the normal word for 'baptistry' (*baptistērion*) or the much rarer *phōtistērion*, of which this passage would be the earliest occurrence – if John had indeed used the word.¹⁰²

7.2 Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria

Fragments from two letters which Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria from 387 to 412, wrote to John are known. The single fragment of one letter remains unedited,¹⁰³ but the standard handbook registers three fragments, all preserved by Palladius, of a warning letter which Theophilus wrote to John some months before the Council of the Oak:

- (a) Judicial matters may not lawfully be tried outside the territory of their origin, but matters affecting each province should properly be settled within that province.
- (b) I think that you are not ignorant of the rule in the canons of Nicaea where they proclaim that 'a bishop shall not exercise jurisdiction outside the boundaries <of his diocese>'.¹⁰⁴ But if you are ignorant <of it>, take note and keep your hands off the accusations against me. For, if it were right for me to be judged, <it should be> by <the bishops> of Egypt, not by you who are seventy five days' journey away.
- (c) It is wrong to admit suits about affairs outside the boundaries of one's own diocese.¹⁰⁵

It seems probable to us that only the second of these passages is a direct quotation from Theophilus' letter. Palladius presents it as such, while both the first and the third passages could well be partial paraphrases of the same passage, the first by John and the third by John's supporters at the Council of the Oak.

101 Kelly 1995, 237; Liebeschuetz 2011, 244.

102 Lampe 1510.

103 CPG 2615.

104 The Nicene canons do not include such an explicit general prohibition; Theophilus in fact paraphrases the second canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Joannou 1962a, 46–47).

105 CPG 2604; John, *Letter to Innocentius*, lines 49–50 Malingrey; Palladius, *Dial.* 7.132–36; *Dial.* 8.183.

7.3 The proceedings of the Council of the Oak

A full documentary record of the so-called Council of the Oak, which condemned and deposed John in the autumn of 403, survived into the middle of the ninth century, when Photius, who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 858 to 867 and again from 877 to 886,¹⁰⁶ included it among the books which he summarized in his 'library'.¹⁰⁷ No other documentary record of this council has survived. We have translated Photius' summary in Appendix A with annotation which confines itself to clarification of the text and brief discussion of other evidence relating to specific charges.

7.4 John's letters to Innocentius, bishop of Rome

John wrote two letters to Innocentius, who was bishop of Rome from 401 to 417.¹⁰⁸ The second, written in 406, says nothing about John in Constantinople, but the first, written in 404, which Palladius quoted entire as the second chapter of his *Historical Dialogue on John*, discloses something of vital importance that is otherwise unknown. John describes the events leading up to his exile and requests the bishop of Rome to convene a council to reverse his condemnation at the Council of the Oak. In the course of his plea to Innocentius, John alludes to an episode which our other sources omit:

As he¹⁰⁹ refused to justify his actions in person, while those who accused him were pressing, the most pious emperor summoned me and ordered me to cross to where he was residing¹¹⁰ and to hear the case against him. For they accused

106 A. Kazhdan, *ODB* 3:1669–90.

107 *CPG* 8611: *Bibliotheca* 59, 17a–19a Bekker, whose text was reprinted by Ubaldi 1903, 94–97, noting emendations suggested by Savile, Hardouin, Montfaucon and Mansi.

108 *CPG* 4402, 4403: *PG* 52.529–536 = Innocentius, *Epp.* 4, 11 (*CPL* 1641); cf. *PCBE* 2.1.1045, Innocentius 7. These two letters were translated into English together with John's two to Innocentius by Stephens 1889, 309–14.

109 That is, John's enemy, Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria, whose part in John's condemnation at the Council of the Oak is described in §§ 52–56.

110 For a different interpretation of the Greek of the main clause of the sentence, see Kelly 1995, 215; Russell 2007, 30, who both take the implicit subject of the imperfect verb διέτριβεν to be the emperor and deduce that Arcadius 'sent John a peremptory message ordering him to present himself at the palace on the eastern side <of the Bosphorus> where he was temporarily residing'. We believe that the implied subject of the verb διέτριβεν is Theophilus and hence that John was summoned to the imperial presence in Constantinople and then ordered to cross the Bosphorus at his audience with the emperor.

Theophilus was residing in an imperial mansion near Chalcedon placed at his disposal by Eudoxia when he arrived in Constantinople (Socrates, *HE* 6.15.12; Sozomen, *HE* 8.17.2–4).

him of assault, murders and countless other <crimes>. However, since I was aware of the laws of the fathers,¹¹¹ and I respected and honoured this man, and moreover had in my hands a letter of his which stated that ‘judicial matters may not lawfully be tried outside the territory of their origin, but matters affecting each province should properly be settled within that province’, I refused to act as his judge, indeed I rejected the proposal with the utmost vehemence. (*Letters to Innocentius* 2, lines 42–52 Malingrey)

It was the Italian scholar Paolo Ubaldi in 1903 who first pointed out that the effect of John’s refusal to preside over the trial of Theophilus embarrassed Arcadius, who had made all the preparations for a council, and gave Theophilus the opportunity to persuade the emperor that the council could meet under the presidency of a bishop other than John.¹¹² As Baynes and Kelly subsequently emphasized, the emperor’s unexpected command presented John with an opportunity which a skilful politician would have exploited without hesitation in order to rid himself of a powerful enemy.¹¹³ But John was too spiritual to be a successful politician – a potentially debilitating flaw in the bishop of a city where a Roman emperor resided. He failed to grasp the opportunity offered, and thereby allowed the initiative to pass to Theophilus who, unlike John, was a ‘consummate diplomat’.¹¹⁴ Theophilus immediately saw how to transform the projected trial in which he was to be arraigned as the defendant into a council presided over by a political ally before which not he, but John, would be accused of malfeasance, and this council, the so-called Council of the Oak, duly condemned and deposed John.

7.5 Letters of Innocentius

Innocentius, the bishop of Rome,¹¹⁵ wrote at least three letters relating to the

This mansion had formed part of the estate of Theodosius’ praetorian prefect, Rufinus, who had built a great palace and installed a monastic settlement for Egyptian monks; after Rufinus was torn limb from limb on 27 November 395, this estate was confiscated and part became an imperial palace (Matthews 1975, 134, 136). Rufinus’ monks returned to Egypt and their monastery was abandoned for some years before being refounded with the name of Rufinianae (Callinicus, *Life of Hypatius* 66; cf. Pargoire 1899; Janin 1964, 504, Carte XIII).

111 John alludes to the ninth and twenty-second of the canons ascribed to the ‘Dedication Council’ of Antioch in 341 and to the second canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Joannou 1962b, 110–11, 121–22; 1962a, 46–47), which forbade bishops to interfere in dioceses outside their formal jurisdiction.

112 Ubaldi 1903, 64–65.

113 Baynes 1955, 106; Kelly 1995, 215–16; Russell 2007, 30–31.

114 Baynes 1955, 105.

115 On whose correspondence in general, see *CPL* 1641–43.

condemnation and exile of John to the following addressees: Theophilus, the clergy and people of Constantinople, and John himself.¹¹⁶

7.6 Palladius, *Historical Dialogue on John*

The *Historical Dialogue of Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, on the Life and Conduct of the blessed John, bishop of Constantinople, called Golden Mouth* survives in a single manuscript of the eleventh century (Laurentianus IX.14) and two critical editions were published in the twentieth century using different numerations of the text.¹¹⁷ The manuscript inserts the words ‘with Theodorus, a deacon of Rome’ after ‘bishop of Helenopolis’. The work does indeed have the form of a dialogue between a bishop and a deacon of Rome named Theodorus, who is addressed by name several times.¹¹⁸ But the text itself consistently styles the interlocutors anonymously as ‘the bishop’ and ‘the deacon’.

It has sometimes been suspected that the words ‘bishop of Helenopolis’ might also be an interpolation into the original title and hence that the attribution of the work to the Palladius who was bishop of Helenopolis and later Aspuna is mistaken. Such was Savile’s opinion in the early seventeenth century,¹¹⁹ and many scholars, including Tillemont, subsequently concurred for diverse reasons until Dom Cuthbert Butler established that Palladius of Helenopolis was indeed the author of both the *Historical Dialogue* and the much later *Lausiaca History*, which survives in several recensions and ancient translations into a variety of languages.¹²⁰

Palladius composed his *Historical Dialogue* in exile at Syene in Upper Egypt and the dialogue itself assumes that John is dead: hence both the dramatic date of the dialogue between the bishop and the deacon and the date of composition should fall in the year 408.¹²¹ The manuscript divides the work into chapters, each with a heading summarising its contents; Malingrey

116 Innocentius, *Epp.* 5 (*PL* 20.493–96); 7 = Sozomen, *HE* 8.26.7–19, but otherwise unknown; 12, quoted by Sozomen, *HE* 8.26.2–6, but otherwise unknown.

117 *BHG* 870 = *CPG* 6037; Coleman Norton 1928; Malingrey and Leclercq 1988; cf. App. E.

118 Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 129.

119 Savile 1613, *Notae in Tomum Octavum* 941–42.

120 *BHG* 3, pp. 190–91 nos. 1435–38v; *CPG* 6036; cf. Butler 1898; 1908; 1921; Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 7–9. For a succinct survey of the controversy, see Coleman Norton 1928, xxxvii–li. Palladius’ authorship of *De gentibus Indiae et Bragmanibus* (*CPG* 6038) remains doubtful.

121 Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 19–21.

and Leclercq analyse its structure as follows:¹²²

- 1.1–125 Prologue
- 1.126–4.185 The context of the reported dialogue
- 5–11 The life of John
- 12–19 Defence of John
- 20 Conclusion

Demetrios Katos has recently analysed Palladius' career and defined both his theological standpoint and his purpose and method in composing the *Historical Dialogue* quite precisely: Palladius was an 'Origenist monk and bishop'; he wrote in defence of John as an advocate for the recently deceased bishop; he produced 'a highly structured composition' in John's defence using the traditional rhetorical form of a narration followed by arguments; and he wrote primarily for a Roman audience, though secondarily for supporters of John in both Antioch and Constantinople.¹²³ Katos also claims that it was Palladius' *Dialogue* that 'fixed John in the popular consciousness as both hero and innocent victim'.¹²⁴ Whether that claim is fully justified need not be decided here, since our central concern in this introduction is to evaluate the ancient sources for the life and career of John, not to discuss his posthumous rehabilitation and his reputation in later centuries. We note, however, that Wendy Mayer has called into question the honesty of Palladius' 'portrayal of John's nomination and election' as bishop of Constantinople and, by implication, the accuracy and fairness of much of his account of John as bishop of the imperial capital.¹²⁵

7.7 Theodoret of Cyrrhus

Although Theodoret says virtually nothing about John in his *Ecclesiastical History*, he composed five speeches (possibly more) about John, which he appears to have delivered in Constantinople at ceremonies celebrating the return of the saint's relics to the city, where they were deposited in the Church of the Holy Apostles on 27 January 438.¹²⁶ The speeches are lost, but they survived until at least the middle of the ninth century, since Photius

¹²² Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 21–22.

¹²³ Katos 2011, 9–97.

¹²⁴ Katos 2011, 34.

¹²⁵ Mayer 2004, esp. 456. For a comparison of the representation of John in the *Funerary Speech* and Palladius, see Tiersch 2002b.

¹²⁶ BHG 878t–x = CPG 6225; cf. above section 1.

had read and excerpted them some years before he included a description of and brief extracts from them in the catalogue of his library.¹²⁷

7.8 The ecclesiastical historians Socrates and Sozomen

The *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates ends with the second year of the 305th Olympiad and the seventeenth consulate of the emperor Theodosius in 439, and it seems probable that he actually completed it in that year.¹²⁸ Socrates had reliable sources of information for events in Constantinople as far back as the two episcopal elections of 337, even though he often puts the episodes whose details he reports accurately in a false chronological context.¹²⁹ Socrates was the principal source throughout for Sozomen, who composed an *Ecclesiastical History* which set out to cover the same period as Socrates (though he did not get beyond the year 425 before he died) and to improve and replace his predecessor in two ways: he rewrote Socrates' plain and unadorned narrative in a more elevated and ornate style and he sought out and used sources of information which Socrates had overlooked.¹³⁰ Hence for the career of John as bishop of Constantinople, Sozomen supplemented Socrates from the *Funerary Speech*, which the earlier historian had not used.¹³¹

7.9 Marcellinus

Marcellinus, a Latin speaker from Illyricum who had the rank or title of *comes*,¹³² composed a continuation of Jerome's *Chronicle* in Constantinople in the sixth century. The original version terminated with the death of the emperor Anastasius in 518, but Marcellinus later continued the chronicle as far as the year 534 and this continuation was later continued by another hand.¹³³ Marcellinus has five entries relating to John: for the first three he used Palladius, for the last two a local Constantinopolitan source or sources drawn on after him by the compilers of other Byzantine chronicles.¹³⁴

127 Photius, *Bibliotheca* 273, whence *PG* 64.89–91; 84.48–53; 104.229–36; translated in App. B.

128 Socrates, *HE* 7.46.8; cf. Barnes 1993, 205.

129 Barnes 1993, 200–04, 212–17.

130 Barnes 1993, 206–08.

131 Above, section 4 n.69.

132 *PLRE* 2.710–11, Marcellinus 9.

133 *Chr. min.* 2.60, 104–08; the end is lost.

134 Marcellinus 398.3, 403.3, 404.1, 428.2, 438.2; see Croke, 2001, 121, 122, 202–04.

7.10 The official calendar of the Church of Constantinople

Baur dismissed the evidence of all surviving Greek synaxaria as valueless.¹³⁵ That peremptory verdict was premature and mistaken. For the official calendar of the Church of Constantinople, which was probably compiled in its present form in the ninth or tenth century,¹³⁶ contains much valuable and accurate information, some of which is not elsewhere on explicit record.¹³⁷ Its entries for John not only state what we believe to be the correct date of 15 December for John's election and consecration as bishop of Constantinople, but also record that it was John who introduced into Constantinople the custom of celebrating the Nativity of Christ on 25 December and that he did so at the request of western Christians – which is correct.¹³⁸

8. JOHN AND EUDOXIA

Aelia Eudoxia married the emperor Arcadius on 27 April 395 and was elevated to the rank of Augusta on 9 January 400.¹³⁹ All our ancient sources agree that she played a large part in sending John into exile, but they are not entirely clear about her precise role, which she inevitably played behind the scenes and largely hidden from view, and they disagree over how Eudoxia's hostility towards John originally arose. It certainly did not go back as far as John's installation as bishop of Constantinople in 397: although Eudoxia's attitude to John's appointment in 397 is not documented, she aided John in his early liturgical innovations in Constantinople with enthusiasm and practical and financial support,¹⁴⁰ and John baptized some of Eudoxia's children, though not all, as is commonly assumed,¹⁴¹ so that their dates of birth are very relevant to deciding when the empress first displayed her hostility to John in public.

135 Baur 1907, 50: 'les données des Synaxaires grecs n'ont aucune autorité historique'.

136 R.F. Taft and N.P. Ševčenko, *ODB* 3:1991; I. Ševčenko 1992, 188 n.52.

137 For example, on Mocius, a martyr during the Diocletianic persecution on the anniversary of whose death Constantine dedicated his new Christian city of Constantinople on 11 May 330 (*Synax. Eccl. Cpl.* 674.24–676.10; cf. Barnes 2011, 126–27).

138 Barnes, 2013. The entries relating to John are translated in App. C.

139 *PLRE* 2.410, Eudoxia 1.

140 Kelly 1995, 138.

141 For example, by Kelly 1995, 172–73; Liebeschuetz 2011, 233.

8.1 The children of Eudoxia and their baptisms

Eudoxia bore her husband five children. The date on which each was born is explicitly attested:

- 1 Flacilla, born on 17 June 397;
- 2 Pulcheria, born on 19 January 399;
- 3 Arcadia, born on 3 April 400;
- 4 Theodosius, born on 10 April 401;
- 5 Marina, born on 10 or 11 February 403.¹⁴²

The *Funerary Speech* documents two further pregnancies of Eudoxia. It records a stillbirth during John's first exile (§§ 66–67) and describes with evident glee Eudoxia's death while giving birth to another stillborn child (§ 121). Socrates omits the gruesome medical details, but adds the precise information that the stillbirth caused the death of Eudoxia, who died on 6 October 404, which was the fourth day after the onset of labour.¹⁴³

The assumption that John baptized all five of Eudoxia's children rests upon two items of evidence. The first is Mark the Deacon's *Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza*, which alleges that John baptized the infant Theodosius II.¹⁴⁴ But the *Life of Porphyry* is a fictitious composition from the sixth century and cannot be used as evidence for events c.400,¹⁴⁵ and the infant Theodosius appears to have been baptized by Severianus of Gabala, not by John.¹⁴⁶ The second is a homily which John is alleged to have delivered after his return from his first exile, which claims of Eudoxia that 'She recalled, she recalled both her children and their baptism: "I recall that my children were baptized by your hands."'¹⁴⁷ But this whole homily, which is conventionally known as the second homily or sermon *Post reditum a priore exilio*, is inauthentic.¹⁴⁸

142 *PLRE* 2.472, Flaccilla 1; 929–30, Pulcheria; 129, Arcadia 1; 1100, Theodosius 6; 723, Marina 1.

143 Socrates, *HE* 6.19.6.

144 [Mark the Deacon], *Life of Porphyry* 47 (pp. 39–40 Grégoire and Kugener).

145 Barnes 2010, 260–83.

146 Barnes 1989, 11, adducing Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* 21: 'he died in the reign of Theodosius the Younger, his son in baptism' (*moritur iunior Theodosio, filio suo in baptismo*). Holum 1982, 54–56, 72–73, uses the *Life of Porphyry* as if it were reliable and argues that John baptized the infant Theodosius on 6 January 402 while Severianus of Gabala 'took the part of godparent' – which appears to be a patent anachronism for the fifth century (Lynch 1986, 117–40).

147 *PG* 52.445.

148 On *CPG* 4399: *PG* 52.443–48, see above, section 7.1.

Its inventions include a quotation from a letter which Eudoxia is alleged to have written to John on the day before he spoke:

Very late in the evening yesterday she sent <a message> which stated in these very words: 'Say to him "My prayer has been fulfilled; ...¹⁴⁹ I have been crowned <even> more than <when I received> the diadem;¹⁵⁰ I have received back the priest, I have restored the head to the body, the steersman to the ship, the shepherd to his flock, the bridegroom to the marriage chamber."¹⁵¹

Since the homily is inauthentic, the words put into Eudoxia's mouth cannot be accepted as genuine. John did not, as its author assumes, baptize all of Eudoxia's children.

8.2 Eudoxia as Jezebel and Herodias

The *Funerary Speech* calls Eudoxia Jezebel three times,¹⁵² though it never calls her Herodias. What of John himself? Palladius reports that John's enemies told the empress that 'he had called her Jezebel' before he was deposed at the Council of the Oak.¹⁵³ And the ecclesiastical historians Socrates and Sozomen record 'a famous sermon' in which John compared Eudoxia to Herodias. Both writers place the sermon after John's return to Constantinople after his first, brief exile and state that it was this sermon which motivated Eudoxia to plan his second and permanent exile.¹⁵⁴ Socrates describes the occasion of the insult as follows:

A silver statue of the Augusta Eudoxia, clad in a cloak, was erected on a porphyry column. The column stood on a high platform, neither too close to nor too far from the Church called <Holy> Wisdom, since a wide street between them separated the two. The children of the inhabitants of the city were accustomed to play constantly on the platform. John, considering what was happening as an insult to the church and exercising his customary freedom of speech (*parrhesia*),¹⁵⁵ armed his tongue anew against those who were doing this. Although it was necessary to persuade the authorities to stop the children's play with soothing

149 We have omitted the words ἀπῆτησα τὸ κατόρθωμα, which Monfaucon translated as 'rem impetravi', apparently in desperation.

150 That is, when Eudoxia was proclaimed Augusta on 9 January 400.

151 PG 52.446.

152 §§ 3, 36, 138.

153 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.247.

154 Socrates, *HE* 6.18.1–6; Sozomen, *HE* 8.20.1–3; cf. Mark 6.16–28.

155 The *Funerary Speech* explicitly praises John for his *parrhesia* (παρρησία) (§ 4 with n.14).

words, John did not do this, but used vehement language and ridiculed those who had permitted it to happen. The empress again interpreted what was said as directed against her, considered John's words as an insult against herself and again prepared for a council of bishops to be assembled against him. When John became aware of this, he delivered in his church that famous homily which begins: 'Herodias rages madly again, dances again and again seeks to receive the head of John on a platter.' This inflamed the anger of the empress even more.

The silver statue was erected by Simplicius, the prefect of the city of Constantinople in 403,¹⁵⁶ but the homily to which Socrates alludes does not survive and neither the *Funerary Speech* nor Palladius says anything whatever about the silver statue. Hence the story in Socrates and Sozomen has been argued to be sheer invention.¹⁵⁷ Against Ommeslaeghe it has been urged that, if John did compare Eudoxia to Herodias in the homily, a sermon 'so offensive to the palace' would have been suppressed by those who made written versions of John's homilies and put them into circulation.¹⁵⁸ (Similarly, an earlier sermon which John is said to have delivered shortly after the departure of Epiphanius from Constantinople in May 403 has disappeared and it too is known only from a report: this states that John's violent denunciations of the manifold weaknesses of women were construed as a personal attack on Eudoxia.)¹⁵⁹ However, John was steeped in the Bible and surely would not have confused the daughter, Salome, who danced for Herod with her mother, Herodias, who instigated her demand for the head of John the Baptist. We believe, therefore, that the story in Socrates depends on a homily which was invented after c.420 and falsely attributed to John.

Although two homilies are transmitted under the name of John which explicitly equate Eudoxia with Jezebel and Herodias, neither constitutes valid evidence for what John himself said. First, the last two chapters of the speech whose conventional Latin title is *Sermo antequam iret in exsilium* and which allude in a satirical manner to charges made against John at the Council of the Oak, do not appear in Anianus' Latin version from c.420 and

156 The base of the statue has survived; *CIG* 8614 = *CIL* 3.736 = *ILS* 822; Socrates, *HE* 6.18.1; Marcellinus 403.2. Theophanes, a. 5898, p. 79.4–12 de Boor, alleges that Simplicius, whom he does not name, was both a Manichee and a pagan, and that when John preached against him because he was annoyed at the noisy festivities celebrated in front of the statue, Simplicius turned Eudoxia against John by telling her that he resented the honour which the statue paid her.

157 Ommeslaeghe 1979.

158 Kelly 1995, 240.

159 Socrates, *HE* 6.15.2–4.

are certainly inauthentic.¹⁶⁰ These spurious chapters proclaim that the seed of Jezebel still survives and that John the Baptist, who was beheaded, now sits at the right hand of God, while the woman who instigated his execution suffers punishment in the hereafter, and that another Herodias is again seeking the head of a John.¹⁶¹ Second, the speech conventionally known as the *Sermo cum iret in exilium* compares John and his predicament with those of a series of biblical heroes – with Elijah sent into exile by Jezebel, with John the Baptist imprisoned while Herodias rejoices, with Joseph arrested because of the lies of Potiphar's wife, with Jeremiah, Jonah, Daniel, Stephen the first martyr and the apostle Paul.¹⁶² But the whole homily is inauthentic.¹⁶³

In sum, therefore, there is no surviving contemporary evidence apart from Palladius that John himself called Eudoxia either Jezebel or Herodias.

8.3 The origin of the antipathy between empress and bishop

It remains to ask when and why Eudoxia became hostile towards John. Although both Kelly and more recently Wolfgang Liebeschuetz have addressed the problem explicitly, both base their discussions on the late and untrustworthy evidence of the *Life of John* by George of Alexandria.¹⁶⁴ This writer and several other Byzantine *Lives of John*¹⁶⁵ have a story that John protested against Eudoxia's confiscation of the vineyard of the impoverished widow of the otherwise unknown senator Theognostus, which was the only property that she retained after her husband had been unjustly exiled. Kelly takes the story to be confirmed in essence by the fact that the *Life of Porphyry* makes John say that he could not approach the emperor Arcadius with the petition which Porphyry and John had brought to Constantinople because 'the empress has made him angry with me because I rebuked her on account of a property which she coveted and then appropriated'.¹⁶⁶ Although Kelly

160 Above, section 7.1, on CPG 4396: PG 52. 427*–32, 431–36.

161 PG 52.431–32.

162 PG 52.437.

163 Above, section 7.1 on CPG 4397.

164 Kelly 1995, 230; Liebeschuetz 2011, 225–26, 232–33, adducing George, *Life of John* 41 (Halkin 1977, 191–96).

165 Ommeslaeghe 1976, 336–37 (BHG 874h §§ 30–33); Halkin 1977, I.38 (Theodore of Trimitheus, *Life of John* 33); IV.294–95 (BHG 873e § 11); V.349–52 (BHG 874d § 41); VI.404–06 (BHG 875d § 19); VII.438–41 (BHG 876m §§ 11–12: Cosmas Vestitor). The story of Eudoxia and the widow's vineyard also appears in the *Life of Epiphanius of Salamis* 61 (BHG 596: PG 41.101–03).

166 [Mark], *Life of Porphyry* 37 (p. 32 Grégoire and Kugener).

acknowledges that many of the picturesque details in the story are ‘plainly legendary’, he declares that ‘doubts about the nucleus of the story’ that John defended a poor and dispossessed widow against Eudoxia ‘are surely misplaced’, while Liebeschuetz simply assumes the veracity of the *Life of Porphyry* when it states that John was already on bad terms with Arcadius in 401, but that ‘early in 401’ he incurred the hostility of Eudoxia ‘because he had accused her of seizing someone’s property’. But Theognostus is an invented, not a historical character,¹⁶⁷ and the author of the *Life of Porphyry* was unaware that on 6 January 402, when he supposed that John baptized the infant Theodosius,¹⁶⁸ the bishop of Constantinople was absent from the city in the province of Asia.¹⁶⁹ Eudoxia’s rapacity was well known both to contemporaries and to later generations.¹⁷⁰ On its correct dating, the *Life of Porphyry* proves only that the story of the widow’s vineyard was current in the reign of Justinian, and we suspect that the story itself was based solely on the belief that John had denounced Eudoxia as Jezebel, as Palladius reported. The comparison encouraged later generations to supply confirmatory details from the biblical story of Naboth’s vineyard (1 Kings 21.5–16).

In reality, relations between the bishop and the empress remained cordial, perhaps even warm, at least in public, after Eudoxia became Augusta on 9 January 400.¹⁷¹ When Vigilius, the bishop of Tridentum, sent the relics of the North Italian martyrs Sisinnius, Martyrius and Alexander (the Anaunensian

167 *PLRE* 2.1106, *!Theognostus!*

168 Duly repeated as fact by Liebeschuetz 2011, 233: ‘on 6 January 402 Chrysostom baptized Eudoxia’s son, the later Theodosius’.

169 For proof that John’s visit to Asia should be dated to the winter of 401/402 rather than earlier, see Cameron 1987, 349–51; Cameron and Long 1993, 94–101, 405–08. The proof relies on combining two independently attested facts.

(1) At the council of bishops in Asia over which John presided, Eusebius of Valentinopolis stated that his suit against his metropolitan Eusebius of Ephesus, which he had initiated by presenting a petition to John in Constantinople in the thirteenth indiction, that is, between September 399 and August 400, had lasted two years (Palladius, *Dial.* 13.150–55; 15.6–7).

(2) In the opening paragraphs of the sermon which he delivered on his return from Asia (*CPG* 4394: Wenger 1961, 114–24 [Greek]; *PG* 52.421–24 [Latin]), John contrasts his absence with that of Moses when he received the tablets of the covenant on Mount Sinai (Exodus 34.27–29): whereas Moses had been absent for only forty days and found the Israelites ‘making idols and stirring up sedition’ (at least according to John), he had returned after an absence of more than one hundred and fifty days to find his congregation in Constantinople at peace.

170 Eunapius, frag. 81 Müller = 72.1 Blockley; Zosimus 5.24.1–2, presumably repeating Eunapius. We accept Blockley’s emendation of the empress whom Eunapius criticized for allowing corruption to flourish from Pulcheria to Eudoxia (Blockley, 1981, 5; 1983, 118).

171 Holum, 1982, 69–71.

martyrs, who had recently been killed in the Val di Non in 397) to Constantinople, John organized an elaborate series of ceremonies for their reception and their deposition in a shrine prepared for them in the Church of Saint Thomas at Drypia on the coast 15 km west of the city.¹⁷² The populace of Constantinople, including high officials, senators and Eudoxia herself, took part on foot in a vast torchlight procession, led by John. When the procession reached the shrine, John delivered a joyful homily in the presence of the empress, 'the whole city and the magistrates'.¹⁷³ He waxed eloquent on how the empress had come on foot like everyone else and discarded her imperial finery so that she could stay as close as possible to the holy relics, in this imitating King David when he escorted the Ark of the Covenant from the house of Obed-edom the Gittite to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6.12–15):

She who wore the diadem and was clothed in purple did not allow herself to be separated even for an instant from the relics during the whole of the journey, but accompanied the saints like a humble servant, holding on to the casket and the linen that covered it, trampling underfoot all human vainglory and in such a theatre revealing herself to the people, even though it is not permitted for all the eunuchs who serve in the imperial halls to gaze on her. ... This lover of Christ followed the relics, touching them continuously, showering them with praises, becoming to everyone else a teacher of this beautiful and spiritual merchandise and teaching all to draw from this spring which is always being consumed but never emptied.¹⁷⁴

John saluted Eudoxia as the only empress who had ever honoured martyrs with such zeal, piety and humility, compared her to women in the New Testament like Phoebe and Priscilla in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 18.2, 26; Romans 16.1), and continued:

We shall not now err if we count you among their number, since you are the harbour of all the churches, and you have made good use of your present imperial rule so that you will acquire the kingdom that is to come, erecting churches, honouring bishops, dissolving the error of heretics, and receiving martyrs, not to your table but in your heart, not in your house but in your affections, or rather in both your home and your affections.¹⁷⁵

172 On the probable identification of the relics promised to John by Vigilius (*Letter 2*, *PL* 13.552–58), see Vanderspoel 1986, 248–49.

173 *BHG* 1191p = *CPG* 4441.1: *PG* 63.467–72. Similar in tone is the homily which John delivered on the following day after the emperor and his retinue had joined the festivities (*BHG* 1191q = *CPG* 4441.2: *PG* 63.473–78).

174 *PG* 63.469.

175 *PG* 63.471.

This does not read like the forced rhetoric of one who was putting on a brave face and felt constrained to praise against his will; rather it should be construed as a sign that the empress had not yet turned against John.¹⁷⁶

It seems probable on a priori grounds that the origins of Eudoxia's antipathy to John go back to his attempts to protect the powerful eunuch Eutropius, the eastern consul of the year, after his fall from power in August 399.¹⁷⁷ In his homilies on the *Epistle to the Colossians*, which John delivered between Eutropius' fall from power and his execution later in 399,¹⁷⁸ he was tactless enough to criticize Eudoxia, or at least to appear to criticize her conduct. Waxing eloquent on the spiritual significance of the chains with which Paul was bound when he was imprisoned in Philippi (Acts 16.22–27), John compared Paul in his chains with the empress in her finery:

What have indolence¹⁷⁹ and courage in common? What bodily adornment with a Christian way of life?¹⁸⁰ Angels respect those chains, these they ridicule. Those chains normally draw <us> from the earth towards heaven, these chains drag <us> down from heaven to earth. For these really are chains, not those. Those are <true> adornment, these <mere> chains. These afflict the soul as well as the body, those adorn the soul as well as the body. Do you wish to learn why those are an adornment?

Tell me: who attracts the attention of the beholder, you or Paul? And what do I mean by 'You'? The empress herself, all bedecked in gold, would not have attracted the attention of the beholder in preference <to Paul>. If it had happened that Paul bound in chains and the empress entered the church at the same time, everyone would have diverted their eyes from her to him, and for a good reason: for to see a man who rises above human nature and has nothing mortal in him, but was an angel on earth is more marvellous than to see a woman in her finery. It is possible to see these things in theatres, in processions and in <public> baths. But it is not an earthly sight when the beholder sees a man bound in chains who both considers that he has the greatest adornment and does not yield to his chains, it is a heavenly one.¹⁸¹

176 Kelly 1995, 140–41.

177 Kelly 1995, 150–51.

178 CPG 4433: PG 62.299–392; cf. Kelly 1995, 150. A passage in the seventh of John's *Homilies on Colossians* refers to a high official who has fallen from power but is still alive (*In Col. 7.3*: PG 63.346–47). John must be referring to Eutropius, who fell shortly before 17 August 399 (*CTh* 9.40.17^s; cf. *PLRE* 2.440–44, Eutropius 1). The date of the homily is, therefore, c. September 399 (Kelly 1995, 133).

179 We are not sure of the exact meaning of βλαχεία here: John uses the noun more than 70 times in a variety of senses (Lampe 298).

180 On the various meanings of φιλοσοφία in John, see Malingrey 1961, 253–88.

181 John, *Homilies on Colossians* 10.4 (PG 62.371).

This comes perilously close to demeaning Eudoxia's appearances in public. Moreover, John also offended the three powerful politicians who were surrendered to Gainas in the spring of 400,¹⁸² and it was after their return that the empress began to show openly the hostility which she felt for John.

The first known occasion on which the imperial couple gave a public signal that John no longer enjoyed their favour was the baptism of their son Theodosius, who was born on 10 April 401 and proclaimed Augustus in the Hebdomon on 10 January 402.¹⁸³ Gennadius of Marseille appears to state that John's enemy, Severianus of Gabala, baptized the infant Theodosius.¹⁸⁴ If it was indeed Severianus who baptized the imperial infant, this was a calculated insult to John whether the baptism was performed before or after he departed for Asia late in 401. For John had baptized Pulcheria and Arcadia, the second and third daughters of Arcadius and Eudoxia, who were born on 19 January 399 and 3 April 400, and perhaps also their elder sister Flacilla, who had been born on 17 June 397 before he came to Constantinople. The surviving literary sources, which were written after John's death and are generally favourable to him, predictably do not record this public humiliation of the bishop of Constantinople.

9. THE HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE NEW TEXT

The *Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*, as we have entitled it, is our earliest surviving account of John's career, and almost certainly the earliest to be composed. The author, whom a tenth-century Byzantine list of those who had written about John apparently names as John's contemporary Cosmas, who had been a deacon under John while he was bishop of Constantinople, composed the *Speech* when news of John's death in Comana on 14 September reached the vicinity of Constantinople, and we presume that he revised and expanded it for publication during the winter of 407/408. Written by one who served under John in Constantinople, the *Speech* offers a different perspective on the bishop from that of Palladius, who wrote his

182 See § 47 n.106; App. A n.11.

183 Socrates, *HE* 6.6.40; *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* 501, 535 (*Chr. Min.* 1.299); Marcellinus 402.2; *Chr. Pasch.* 567–69 Bonn = pp. 58–59 Whitby and Whitby. In the first of the two entries in the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* the year is correct, but the day must be emended to <iiii> idus Apr(iles), while in the second the day is correct (iiii idus Ianuarias), but the notice is wrongly placed under the year 403.

184 Above, section 8.1 at n.145.

Historical Dialogue on the Life and Conduct of the blessed John, bishop of Constantinople in exile in Egypt in the year 408, possibly as early as the spring. The *Speech* offers a fuller account than Palladius of John's activities in Constantinople and of events there, for example, of John's construction of a hospice for lepers and the resistance that it provoked (§§ 61–65), of the stillbirth that induced Eudoxia to persuade her husband Arcadius to recall John from exile in the autumn of 403 (§§ 66–67), and of the persecution of John's followers in the months following his exile, an account that includes significant new information about prefects of the city of Constantinople (§§ 117–32).¹⁸⁵ Perhaps most significant of all is the fact that the *Speech* presents John as a modern Job who consistently turned the other cheek and refused to resist the exercise of imperial power even when he considered it unjust (§§ 3, 27, 30, 83, 109, 127) – unlike the invented John of later hagiography.¹⁸⁶

We have set out to make this new evidence accessible to a wider audience than patristic scholars and professional Late Roman historians, though we naturally hope that both these groups may find something of value in our translation of Cosmas' often opaque and obscure Greek and our commentary. We wish to emphasize that, in our notes on the *Speech*, we have concentrated on bringing out the value of the new evidence and have deliberately decided on the whole to avoid detailed comparison of what the *Speech* says with the other, sometimes discrepant, ancient sources, preferring to leave it to others to use its evidence to produce a new and more rounded historical reconstruction of John's turbulent tenure of the see of Constantinople and of his relations with the imperial court.

185 See our introduction to John's letters, section 2, s.v. Gemellus, Optatus, Paeanius.

186 See above, section 8.2.

TRANSLATION

<FUNERARY SPEECH FOR BISHOP JOHN>¹

PROEMIUM²

1 I would never have wished, my friends,³ to launch myself into this speech, nor to become the messenger of a famine of words (Amos 8.11), nor to open my lips and move my tongue on such a subject, on which the multitude of my tears drowns out my words. But since most people consider it to be, and indeed it truly is, a mark of extreme insensitivity when a child escorts his father to the grave in silence, come, let us join in sending forth to him modest first offerings through what you hear from the words which he himself gathered for us by zeal and prayer. For, if this last honour is owed most of all to fathers by their children for their paternal labours, it would be much more appropriate for me to do this who have tasted his paternal instruction,⁴ both because he was for us an agent not of entry into the present life, but of rebirth in God, and because, having given us the authority to speak in the prime of our youth,⁵ he has also provided the ability to speak.

2 And I fear, my friends, that I may by my words diminish that blessed⁶ man who was great in deeds, and that I may bring on myself a curse instead of a blessing (Genesis 27.12). But, since it is agreed by all that the merits of the man surpass the expressive capacity of language, confidence comes even to

1 On the title and authorship of the speech, see Introduction, sections 2–4.

2 We have followed Ricci in supplying headings to each of the main sections of the *Speech*, but we have sometimes changed her wording.

3 The address used here (literally ‘o men’) is standard in classical Greek when a man starts to speak to a group of men, particularly men whom he knows personally (Dickey 1996, 26–27, 69, 85, 153, 203). Here, however, the speaker may deliberately echo the opening of Paul’s speech to those who were shipwrecked with him off Malta (Acts 27.21).

4 The author plays on the etymologically related Greek terms for ‘son’ (παῖς, *pais*) and ‘instruction’ (παίδεια, *paideia*).

5 If this is not a mere commonplace, it implies that the speaker was ordained a priest by John; for discussion, see Introduction, sections 3, 4.

6 The Greek adjective used here (μακάριος) is conventional for the virtuous dead.

me, because if anyone contributes a mere couple of words⁷ in praise of that man with the appropriate intention, he will, like the widow who contributed her two obols (Mark 12.41–44; Luke 21.1–4), depart crowned with glory. For it is impossible by means of words to reach the level of his true worth, unless one had borrowed his tongue from him while he was alive. For he alone was able both to live and to describe in words the sort of life that he lived. Our talent crawls along the ground, our tongue is weak and our words are unpleasing, insignificant and halting, but measured by our intention we would not appear inferior to anyone.⁸

3 Great as is the dejection that grips our assembly, equally great I think is the pleasure that has seized the choir of the holy ones, each of whom has received the one whom he desired. Abel is consoled by seeing another Abel conspicuous for piety and for this reason attacked out of envy and struck down by a brother's right hand (Genesis 4.1–16). Abraham draws to himself one who welcomes guests (Genesis 18.1–10), and Isaac in turn draws the prudent one.⁹ Jacob summons the man without affectation (Genesis 25.27),¹⁰ who has throughout his life been trained in every sort of affliction. Joseph enfolds in his arms one bound and sold by his brothers, who has endured the madness of Egyptians (Genesis 37.12–36; 39.7–23). Moses also has one who shares his zeal and is gentler than all men (Numbers 12.3), one short of stature and <yet> sturdy in the greatness of his nature; and Aaron sees a high-priest who urged his people to be calm and was not persuaded to sin along with them.¹¹ Nor does the blessed Job offer the place beside him in the choir to any other in preference to this just man (Job 1.6–12); for he will recognize in him those struggles which they both had against the Devil, and in which they overcame and gained from the Lord the same proclamation of victory. David too dances with the good shepherd who through the whole night and day scared the wild animals away from his rational flock (1

7 A not uncommon meaning of the plural noun συλλαβαί in late Greek (Sophocles 1887, 1024).

8 For the rhetorical commonplace that an author who praises is inadequate to his subject, see, for example, Eusebius, *HE* 10.4.1; *Life of Constantine* 1.2.1–3, 10.1; cf. Cameron and Hall 1999, 184: 'modesty is a standard *topos* of the panegyrist'.

9 Wallraff tentatively identifies an allusion to Genesis 22.6–8 (Abraham's preparations for the sacrifice of Isaac). We do not find that convincing, but cannot identify the passage to which allusion is made.

10 Modern English translations render the original Hebrew adjective (שָׁנִי), used of Jacob, as 'quiet', but the Septuagint has ἀπλαστός, which normally means 'natural, unaffected' (LSJ 190, s.v.).

11 Wallraff tentatively suggests an allusion to Exodus 32.1–6, 21–25.

Samuel 16.11, 19; 17.34–37; Psalm 22.1). Elijah kisses the zealous enemy of Jezebel, who for a long time resisted her attack on God (1 Kings 18–21);¹² Elisha embraces the double Elijah, who, though he has not brought dead bodies back to life, has led the souls of men deadened by their sins back to life in Christ by the teaching of his word and of his life. The Baptist gazes on the bearer of his name, Peter on the bulwark of the church (Matthew 16.18; Galatians 2.9); Paul has received one with the same character, who was weak before the weaknesses of others (1 Corinthians 9.22), who was inflamed at the scandals of his brothers, who carried around in his soul care for churches throughout the world (2 Corinthians 11.28–29), who was always dying, but never tasted death (2 Corinthians 6.9); and the choir of the martyrs has received one who fought with them and with them won the crown. In short, all <the holy ones> have one of their own.

4 We alone are left as orphans, in desolation, in darkness and confused in thought,¹³ with a varied, all-consuming loss.¹⁴ For by those things which that blessed man possessed when he arrived among the holy ones, he has shown of how many he has deprived us. His soul, the receptacle of virtues, has flown from his body and is dancing with them, while among us those winged lips have closed in silence, my friends, and the tongue is at rest that yielded to silence only in death, or rather, has not even now lost its freedom of speech,¹⁵ but has stored it away beforehand in books as a provision of consolation for the present famine,¹⁶ which the wise Joseph did by announcing through grace and combining by wisdom both scarcity and abundance in Egypt (Genesis 41.46–49), and now, though silent, finding voice through all who speak. For, just as when a spring is divided into streams, each of those who draw water gives thanks for its abundance not to the water channels but to the spring, so now too, when any man utters a statement which has the teaching of the Spirit, the listeners do not accept it as his labour, but¹⁷ as the product of the blessed one. The demons, the enemies of our nature, are therefore setting up a trophy in great security over many each day, since that

¹² Jezebel is the empress Eudoxia (cf. §§ 36, 138).

¹³ Literally, ‘in the storm of reasonings’ (ἐν ... τῇ τῶν λογισμῶν ζάλῃ); the phrase appears to be taken from John, *Against the Jews*, Homily 8.6 (PG 48.936); *Homilies on Genesis* 65.1 (PG 54.559).

¹⁴ We take ζημία here broadly in the sense of ‘loss’ rather than ‘penalty’.

¹⁵ For the importance of παρρησία (‘freedom of speech’) for John, see Bartelink 1985; Wallraff 2007, 45 n.6.

¹⁶ The ‘famine of words’ of § 1.

¹⁷ The Greek has ἢ (‘or’), but an adversative is needed, as Ricci sees.

trumpet has been deprived of its sound and no longer calls the soldiers of Christ to their spiritual weapons. Instead <there is> now in great abundance a mania for horse-racing and every type of harmful and unseemly spectacle, since that lyre formerly diverted to itself each desire even of the lazy, not to mention of the serious, but now no longer does so.¹⁸

5 What sort of drunken envy has burst in upon the church of God? Who has carried off our wealth? What soul of stone, having received these things through hearing, does not weep tears in reply? But in truth, if I were being dragged along by the suffering of my soul, I would assuredly have been compelled to lapse into the foolishness of a formal lament, something unworthy both of my subject and of any recipient of my speech. Accordingly, if I am after all able, I shall redirect my speech into another channel and, by narrating in your presence some facts about that holy soul, I shall persuade both myself and you, my brothers, not to honour our father with tears alone, which by common tradition have been given to those who have simply lived their lives and then departed in the natural course of events, but much rather to glorify him with praise and with hymns like one of those superior beings, because he completed his life here better than is humanly possible and has been transferred to an unsullied life of blessedness. Hence, if I were following the custom of secular encomiums, I would certainly be discoursing on his distinguished ancestry, the fame of his native city, the abundance of his wealth, his way of life, his education and all the other things¹⁹ whose absence does not discredit a Christian and whose presence does not make him more distinguished, and I would have, if I so wished, a great abundance of material in these things too. As it is, however, I shall try to bring before you some small items of his life in Christ.²⁰

18 John frequently expressed his disapproval of spectacles as bishop in Constantinople as he had as a priest in Antioch (Vandenberghe 1955; Leyerle 2001, 42–74; Tiersch 2002a, 49–54, 244–48). The speech appears to allude specifically to chariot-racing and the mime, which were the most popular entertainments in John's day; on them see, respectively, Cameron 1976; Barnes 1996, 166–76.

19 An influential rhetorical handbook composed c.300 advised writers of panegyrics to proceed through a series of standard topics in the following order: introduction identifying the occasion of the speech, geographic origin (if resplendent) and family (if noble) of the person praised, portents or omens at his birth, his upbringing, his achievements (by categories), comparisons with other famous men and an epilogue containing suitable prayers (Menander Rhetor 76–95 Russell and Wilson). For Claudian's faithful adherence to this schema, see Cameron 1970, 83–84, 253.

20 Eusebius promised a similar concentration in the introduction to his *Life of Constantine*: he would record 'actions dear to God' and 'write down what relates to the life which is dear to God' (1.10.4, 11.1, trans. Cameron and Hall).

JOHN BEFORE HE BECAME BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE

6 When he entered on the wonderful life of the monks²¹ – for anyone to do this is the same as to abandon the earth and hasten towards heaven. Please do not speak to me of those who make a business of this profession, and <please> do not attempt to discredit something which reaches for the vaults of heaven because of a few who adopt the appearance but not the reality of <their vocation>²² and treat the starting place for eternal life as an opportunity for profit, but learn the way that monks really conduct their life: <then> you will see that it greatly rivals the way of life of the angels. Shall we all revile and hate Paradise because of the sin of Adam in Paradise? In fact, we do not think it holy even to say this: transferring the blame to Eve, who was deceived, and Adam whom she persuaded, we will marvel at the place and will ask for permission to enter it again from the Lord, who is merciful and good—

when then he entered that tranquil and greater than earthly life, having been told, or rather having learned by experience, that the health of the flesh stands in opposition to the tuning of the soul, he immediately raged so much against the flesh that afterwards he did not need to give a single thought to the war against it. For having amputated the passions of the flesh²³ through continence and having made it obedient, he had made the course to heaven very easy for his soul.

7 Then, as if moored in a safe harbour, he concentrated his whole attention on the reading and understanding of the divine scriptures.²⁴ And having realized that it would be exceedingly absurd for the young to exert themselves on the empty outpourings of poets, orators and philosophers, especially since the only fruit which this produces is glibness, and for those who were advancing towards eternal life to be confused at what is said by the Holy Spirit, close their Bibles and consider the former to be necessary, the latter superfluous and <hence> to waste their time to no effect even when

21 In 372.

22 We have tried to reproduce the antithesis *σχῆμα οὐ πρᾶγμα*.

23 John used the verb *περιζώπτω* ('amputate') more than 90 times, the noun *σείσημα* (in its metaphorical sense of 'passion') more than 50 times and the combination of *τὰ σείσηματα τῆς σαρκός* ('passions of the flesh') with variations in word order 16 times.

24 The orator carefully separates the two stages of John's retreat from the world in the years 372–78 (Kelly 1995, 28–35): four years in a monastic community (372–76) followed by two years as a solitary (376–78), during which time he learned the Bible by heart (Palladius, *Dial.* 5.16–25; Sozomen, *HE* 8.2.5).

<the Bible> lies open before them²⁵—

steering clear of this thought as if it was the greatest sin, he stored up all the <sacred> books in his soul down to the last syllable, <believing that> the recollection of what has been said resides more in memory than in characters written down on paper with ink (2 John 12.1). And that he prayed on his knees incessantly, one might learn less from us than from his enemies; for they say that his knees were completely worn out, and their insults turn into encomia and their mocking into garlands of praise.²⁶

8 Being filled with knowledge and having comprehended the full meaning of the scriptures in his mind (for being such a man he also found the finest guide), he then approached initiation into the divine mysteries and received baptism,²⁷ with a certain holy bishop, who was then fleeing the madness of the Arians and had arrived at his lodging at the end of the persecution, performing the service for him.²⁸ But forgive my intention of pressing on to the main point prematurely.

9 When God, who from eternity manages everything for the salvation of the human race, then saw his chosen vessel (Acts 9.15) hiding in the desert, he did not allow the best helmsman to remain for a long time on dry land nor the doctor who was fully capable of demonstrating his skill in the sicknesses of <men's> souls to remain idle, but, having pointed him out with an invisible finger to the then archbishop,²⁹ he led him for a time to the service of the mysteries after the service of the scriptures.³⁰ In this office, it was possible

25 We owe our translation of this difficult passage to Richard Price, who suspects a lacuna at § 7.8.

26 John's solitary habits provided the basis of several charges against him at the Council of the Oak (App. A).

27 For μυσταγωγία as baptism, see Lampe 890, s.v. John was baptized, presumably at Easter, in 368 or 369 (see Introduction, section 1).

28 Meletius, formerly bishop of Antioch for a brief period in the early 360s, was the leader of one group of Christians in Antioch until the emperor Valens compelled him to leave the city (Brennecke 1988, 232–34). After the death of Valens at the battle of Adrianople on 9 August 378, Meletius was restored to the see of Antioch with imperial backing (Theodoret, *HE* 5.2, 3.1, 3.9–16; cf. Barnes 1997, 13–16). The *Funerary Speech* seems to imply that John was baptized in the late 370s rather than the late 360s.

29 Meletius again, here called ἀρχιερεὺς ('chief priest' or 'high priest') as bishop of the metropolitan see of Antioch.

30 The author plays with two senses of the noun διακονία, which has the general meaning of 'service' as well as the specific meaning of 'diaconate' (Lampe 351). John was ordained deacon by Meletius probably very early in 381 before he departed for the Council of Constantinople (Palladius, *Dialogue* 5.34–35; Socrates, *HE* 6.3.10).

to behold in this man the dignity, modesty, the cast of gaze, deference and all the other qualities that Paul demanded of deacons (1 Timothy 3.8–10) rather than to hear <of them> from the present author.

10 The people,³¹ beholding his acuity in public debates and his expertise concerning the divine scriptures – for he treated every meeting with friends, however simple, as an opportunity for divine teaching, and because his heart was brimful of the divine oracles, the words somehow leapt forth without his even trying; and while he seemed to be looking elsewhere, he was intent only on heaven. For when his capable nature and willing mind came together with each other, there came also the foremost among good things,³² grace—everyone, therefore, seeing these things, began to say that the man was being slighted, because, although he was capable of performing greater services for them, he was entrusted with lesser ones. For they alleged that his work was appropriate for men who had done no more than live in piety, and that one would find many such men; but that the ability to hold the diaconate of the Word intermixed with piety belonged to few who were extremely rare. What was more, thinking that wrong was being done to them, they began continually to implore the then archbishop, summoning the one who was worthy to the priesthood.

11 But he delayed – whether he had suffered something and was irritated when he observed John’s charm or because he wanted to make him more desirable and more lovable, I cannot say. However that may be, there was a delay in order to make his ordination more glorious, since God was managing the affair. For when that holy fast arrived³³ – one ought to call it holy for many reasons, both because of its very nature and because of the suffering of our Lord and Saviour, and because, knowing how to correct every soul to be better, it displays its power at that time in particular, not allowing even theatre-goers³⁴ to be completely deprived of the taste of its virtue or benefit—so when Lent, as I said, arrived, there coincided then at that time fear of earthquakes, of drought and of an enormous threat,³⁵ a fear that shook

31 As so often, *λαός* designates the Christian community of a city, here Antioch (Lampe 792–93, s.v. 5).

32 The phrase ‘the foremost among good things’ (*τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν*) occurs in no Greek writer before John, who used it 34 times (and the *TLG* registers only seven occurrences in later writers).

33 Lent began on 15 February in 386; John was ordained priest on 26 February (App. C).

34 Literally, ‘those in the orchestra’.

35 Unfortunately, there is no complete and reliable modern list of earthquakes recorded for the fourth and fifth centuries (Cameron 1987, 344).

the minds even of the totally carefree, and cowardice in the face of death gathered the fish for the fisherman. Then indeed all were asking that they be given their teacher. <The bishop> would have granted <this> without their asking because of the great number who had gathered in the church and because of the shortage of teachers.³⁶ The ordination took place then for the first and only time with such great acclaim and shouting, crowning both the one who had been chosen and the one who chose.

12 When he therefore went into the stadium,³⁷ he showed that not a single one of those who had previously said anything remarkable about him was a liar or rather he showed that they were all liars, since they had not been able to say or imagine anything worthy of the truth. For by taking over the helm of the <divine> word, while the church was still submerged under the mighty wave of the madness of Arius and had lost some of its children in the midst of the storm, with some yielding out of fear of the man who was then emperor,³⁸ others having succumbed to persecution, and others simply laying down for themselves a rule of submission, that their souls no less than their bodies should act according to the whims of those in power—with all such examples abounding, this blessed man then brought back with incredible speed those who had wandered off and deposited the pure silver of orthodox doctrines, requested the payment of interest with great abundance and emptied the treasuries of the heresies. For it was not possible for someone who had tasted his teaching still to need to defer payment for salvation.³⁹ And so the people henceforth performed for him the service of persuading those who needed treatment simply to come to church. They, though anticipated by others in coming to their first liturgical celebration, did not yet present themselves at a second before themselves netting others.⁴⁰ In

36 That is, teachers of correct doctrine; the Christians of Antioch were at this time divided into several competing groups (see still Cavallera 1905).

37 This 'stadium' is probably a metaphorical one and not the stadium at Daphne, a suburb of Antioch (Downey 1961, 326–26, 649–50).

38 The eastern emperor Valens supported and sustained the official homoean church in the East, that is, the church of those who accepted the creed of the Council of Constantinople in January 360, which had rejected the Nicene creed and asserted that the Son was merely 'like' the Father instead of being 'of one substance with the Father'; after Valens' death in August 378 the homoean church rapidly collapsed (Barnes 1997, 4–6, 13–16).

39 This passage employs several technical terms from banking and finance; in our opinion they include ἀναβολή (LSJ 99–100, s.v.).

40 The verb 'to net' (σαγγρεύω) is a favourite of John's: the *TLG* registers a total of 390 occurrences in the whole of Greek literature, the three highest totals for individual writers being 110 in Cyril of Alexandria, 48 in John Chrysostom and 11 in Basil of Caesarea.

general, he so reformed the character of all that the citizens of Antioch took the name of ‘Christians’ then rather than when they received the good news preached by the Apostles (Acts 11.19–26). For then they underwent the yoke because they were overawed by the wonderworking of miracles, and when they were asked by the Greeks or the Jews to explain the belief which they held, they took refuge in the <mere assertion of> belief like a child at the breast in its mother’s cradling arms. Now, however, the craftsman skilled in such matters has taught their descendants to ridicule pagans,⁴¹ do down Jews and spit on every form of heresy: putting their mastery on display, they can either convince those who are well disposed and are coming over to the side of the truth of their own accord or refute those who deliberately embrace error and, taking delight in evil out of a love of strife rather than <acting> out of a desire for the better, cut themselves off from the church.

JOHN IN CONSTANTINOPLE

13 Again, therefore, when God saw that <the Christians of Antioch> were going to be sufficient in themselves, as the end result showed, while the holy one was driving a pair of horses still fervent in temperament and was labouring to give birth to the salvation of many by his great abundance of speech, he arranged for the honour due to him to be realized for the benefit of a larger number of souls. Seeing a great and populous city, greater than all those that lie under the sun, inferior to one city alone – I speak here of the city of Constantinople, the daughter of Rome,⁴² in which is set the throne of the emperor, which persuades those from everywhere who need help to look to it, <where> there is a multitude of magistrates since the emperor is present, and crowds of soldiers, and of men bearing shields and spears, whose units one would not easily count. <There is> thriving trade, since every ship brings everything from everywhere to the city, and <there is> much gold and much silver in the city, which flutters around uselessly and in vain, some of it being accumulated and buried unjustly, gathered from the tears of the poor, some of it being spent more unjustly and more illegally,

41 The author uses the same noun (ἑλληνες) as he had when referring to non-Jews in the time of the Apostles; by John’s lifetime, it was normally used by Christian writers to mean ‘pagans’ (Cameron 2011, 14–25).

42 For Constantinople as ‘the daughter of Rome’, see Libanius, *Letter* 972.5; Paul the Silentiary, *Description of Hagia Sophia* 164–67.

contributing to no end except the ruin of both those who give and those who receive it, and what is still more grievous, those who do this regard their activity as the height of happiness; and <there is> there a multitude of false accusations and slanders plotting and making some who were rich destitute and others exiles and wanderers, and not allowing some to escape the hands of the public executioners, since those <who are> held in high esteem in the emperor's house are always envied, while the very men who envy them press on to being in their turn the object of envy by others, while not even those who have succeeded in being close to the emperor are ever satisfied with their wealth—

our common Saviour and God, seeing that this city needed the oversight of this saint, brought him and put him in charge of the city.⁴³ Enthusiasm for this appeared to be displayed by persons who most needed his freedom of speech for the correction of their ways, <but> who later changed their minds, set aside that fine enthusiasm and reproached themselves when they were stung by his criticisms and counted his care for them a starting point for hatred.⁴⁴

14 The greater ordination then did not appear to be inferior to the earlier as regards glory. For, on the former occasion, those who wished for this to happen were many and enthusiastic, and no-one opposed, not even <John>, who was not himself expecting to become <a priest> when it happened; but nonetheless postponement by the archbishop made his ordination more glorious for him.⁴⁵ On the later occasion, all those who happened to have tasted the honey of the bee (I mean of the tongue of this blessed man) and all who had heard from them and had been drawn into longing <for it> were in favour, but those who voiced opposition were many, great and not undistinguished. Some of them came from those who belonged to that great and illustrious assembly,⁴⁶ others from those whose only boast was that they had grown old in the clergy and who thought that that was uncontestedly owed to them because of their age and who dreamed in their sleep of possessing it. The latter were every day whispering into the ears of the bishops who had convened for this purpose and causing trouble: each one said that another ought to become <bishop>, being too ashamed to name

43 In succession to Nectarius, who had been bishop of Constantinople since 381; on the date of John's consecration (15 December 397), see App. C.

44 This appears to be an oblique allusion to Arcadius and Eudoxia.

45 Above, §§ 10–11.

46 The Senate of Constantinople.

himself, although many on account of the impetuosity and rashness of their character were incapable of reining in their tongues and concealing their sick ambition in silence.⁴⁷ And there was much talk that some resembled Simon in character (Acts 8.18–19), carried around wicked purses with them and tried to purchase favour. There was opposition too from not a few of the bishops,⁴⁸ who because of their own misdeeds foresaw that they would live in peril if this man obtained that office.

15 So then, since neither all the magistrates <in office> nor <all> those who had retired from various offices to the most honoured repose nor all the clergy <of the city> wanted this, and <since the clergy> were uselessly and vainly opposing, because each <of them> aspired to the honour and was pushing himself forward, how could <the fact> that this man, having come quietly and unwillingly to that city (as none is unaware) and not having uttered a word in anyone's hearing about this matter, received the votes of all and was admitted into the order of bishops not be the greatest proof for those who have sense that the saint had truly acquired the vote and verdict of God? For when those who themselves desired to become <bishop> realized that they were attempting the impossible, and when those who spoke against the election of this man realized that they were kicking against the goads (Acts 26.14), they finally came to one opinion and reluctantly accepted the decision.

16 And so when the Sunday came,⁴⁹ rumour racing around the ears of all announced what had happened, and a longing, striking their minds more intensely than any goad, drove those who heard into the church, and all ages and both sexes ran sparing nothing, with no heed of physical shame, of bodily weakness, of tearing their clothing, of losing money, things that normally occur in a crowd as it surges forward. Standing on high the one who was performing the consecration said that <divine> grace had chosen the man for the episcopate of the city.⁵⁰ At that moment, if the great shout <that went up> was only from human beings, one would have said that all

47 On John's election, see Kelly 1995, 104–11.

48 The orator refers to the bishops whom Arcadius had ordered to come to Constantinople to elect and consecrate John (Socrates, *HE* 6.2.4; Sozomen, *HE* 8.2.13).

49 Bishops were normally consecrated on a Sunday; John was consecrated on 15 December 397 (App. C).

50 The author does not name the bishop, but the senior bishop present in Constantinople at the time was Theophilus of Alexandria; he presumably, therefore, presided at John's formal election and consecration.

had exceeded their human nature, but if angels too answered in unison from on high adding the acclamation ‘he is worthy’ – sometimes I am convinced <that this happened>, for the consecration had already been completed, but the acclamations did not cease. Even the one wearing the purple robe and the diadem around his head⁵¹ (for he happened to be inside <the church> confirming the decision) was so overwhelmed by the shouts themselves and the multitude of those shouting that he showed his astonishment by his stance, his expression and his look. And so the prudent departed in joy each with praise and glorification of God who had done these things. But those whose vain hopes had been destroyed walked away with heads bowed, in agony and cursing those who were uttering praises.

17 At the beginning he did not think that he needed to give everyone proof of his power in speaking or of the mildness of his character, and he showed himself willing to say something to those who were then opposing those who had elected him.⁵² He did this for these two reasons. The first was that he looked with suspicion on the harm arising from his excessive charm and wished to douse the fire caused by it a little by his unapproachable manner and by appearing not at all to want to speak in church, knowing how to hold himself at the ready for whenever he wanted to set it ablaze again. The second <reason> was that, because that city had lain in great desire and desperate need of teachers for a very long time, since the one to whom the oversight of that church had fallen before this blessed man did not possess the energy of spirit to be capable of speaking,⁵³ it happened that some fellow came there, to sum things up briefly,⁵⁴ a bishop of the least among the cities in Syria, thirsting to make the people drink those trivial words of his with uncertain parentage⁵⁵ (for one who is very thirsty even the smallest amount of cloudy water seems sufficient)—

51 That is, the emperor Arcadius.

52 On John’s early years in Constantinople, see Kelly 1995, 111–44.

53 Nectarius became bishop of Constantinople in 381 and died on 27 September 397.

54 The *TLG* registers 40 occurrences of the expression ὀλίγα ἐκ πολλῶν (‘few from many’); it almost always refers to the selection of a few items from among many.

55 An allusion to Severianus of Gabala, who maintained close and friendly relations with his fellow Syrian John at the start and preached often in the capital in Greek with a Syriac accent (Sozomen, *HE* 8.10.1–2; cf. Socrates, *HE* 6.11.1–3). The compound adjective πολυπάτωρ (‘of many fathers’, i.e., of uncertain parentage) is a learned insult: Severianus’ words were bastards because they lacked identifiable patristic authority. The idea can be found in Euripides, *Trojan Women* 766–67. But the only occurrence of the word registered in the *TLG* is *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*, ed. C. Wendel (Leipzig, 1914), 340.17.

the lofty and humble soul, who was lofty or humble according to the demands of the moment, since he was unwilling either to destroy that man's reputation at once or to exalt himself and to appear to cloak envy rather than his <good> nature with beauty, continued to maintain silence with greater effort at that time rather than speaking, magnanimously enduring the reproaches that came both from those who opposed him and from those who loved him intensely, who now no longer tolerated the insults from the others.

18 When he had with difficulty persuaded that fellow to keep quiet because he had nothing to say, he then arose and released the stream <of his eloquence>, a stream which imitated the one in Paradise (Genesis 2.10–14), but which, if truth be told, perhaps even bubbled over.⁵⁶ For the stream that went forth from there split into four rivers, of which one flowed past the land of the Ethiopians, another past the land of the Assyrians, and the other <two> past the lands of other peoples, but the flowing streams of this man's tongue traversed the whole land of both Greeks and barbarians. Then the sons of truth were raised up and the offspring of envy were laid low, considering the prosperity of the church as a punishment for themselves, and the one group was cheerful, the other downcast. But as time went on, they too put aside a small part of their madness, charmed by hearing his words, just as the famous Saul was once by the lyre of David (1 Samuel 16.23), and they were able to be amazed because his speech was drawing them towards this and they could not be vexed because its style was overpowering them.

19 I will tell those who are lovers of signs about a sign that came then from God <showing> that the saint had obtained the oversight of Christ's flock very justly and that the vote had been cast from on high by the clear sound of shouts, the most divine sign of all signs. What is this <sign>? Peace. For just when the saint entered on his episcopate, then for the first and only time did the inheritance of Christ truly visit the earth, which he bequeathed to his Apostles when he was about to be nailed to the cross, saying: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give you' (John 14.27). After a long time the dispute of the fathers about their communion with each other was resolved, with those in the West and those throughout the East and those in between the two <sides> being in communion with one another.⁵⁷ And just like an

56 John seems to have been fond of the verb *ὑπερβλύζω* ('bubble over'): although he uses it only nine times out of a total of 66 occurrences in the *TLG* canon, no earlier writer is known to have used it more than three times.

57 The temporal context indicated is the period after John had become bishop of Constantinople in 397, but we cannot identify any resumption of previously disrupted communion

angel descending from the sky as a bestower of concord, so this amazing man brought together the whole world, making the many churches truly one, when the one church had formerly been divided into many parts. In contrast, when the just man was forcibly removed from the city, peace flew off once again from the earth, with hardly a sound, saying only: 'Without this amazing man who has learned my nature well and has sown it among the whole human race, I will in no way tolerate living on the earth.' Again the affairs of the church lapsed into discord or rather into schism.

20 But you will hear about these matters in due course in the chronological sequence of events. For the present let us luxuriate in the virtues of our father. I think that anyone who saw that holy man talking would have said that he was completely engrossed in the scriptures, passing the whole day and night with them, battling sleep. <Anyone who saw him> taking on the protection of the poor and of widows, <would have said> that he wished to have no task other than this; <anyone who saw him> eagerly pursuing the complete destruction and abolition of idols and temples, <would have said> that his sole undertaking was war against these things; <anyone who saw him> gathering together the ranks of monks of both the sexes, <would have said> that he seemed to treat all his other tasks as bishop as secondary; and <anyone who saw him> making an impartial test and scrutiny of ordinations, would have said that he thought that this was the only path of salvation for bishops. Thus all things were carried out to complete perfection by a man who was not large in stature or indeed of sound health,⁵⁸ but possessed a soul that reached the sky.⁵⁹

21 The large majority of very distinguished bishops – for the others I do not even wish to record: <I mean> of the really excellent bishops – entrust different responsibilities to different <assistants> and each thinks that his duty consists in inactivity alone. But this most wise man, thinking that not even an estate would make a profit for a manager who put another in charge

between eastern and western churches at this period. It is probable, therefore, that this is deliberate chronological displacement designed to give John credit for something that had happened much earlier.

58 John's health is a constant topic in his letters to Olympias (Neureiter 2010). That is not surprising in view of his persistent maltreatment, but he often reassured Olympias; for example, one of his last letters protested that he was both safe and in good health, so that the people of Armenia were all amazed that one with so weak and spidery a body could tolerate the intolerable cold of the unusually severe winter of 406/407 (*Letter to Olympias* 17.4b, cf. App. F).

59 Another favourite word of John's: the *TLG* registers a total of 136 occurrences of οὐρανομήκης (*Odyssey* 5.239) in total, with 25 in John and no more than eight in any other writer.

of his affairs, while he drank and slept, not to speak of the church, for which he himself will render account without being able to point his finger at others, – for this reason he directed everything by his own efforts and skill. And to those among his friends who criticized this he said: ‘How many myriads of angels and archangels do you think Christ has (cf. Daniel 7.10)? Or will Daniel not allow you to be completely ignorant? Christ entrusted the salvation of the church to none of these, but <it was> for this that he who rides upon the Cherubim (cf. Daniel 3.55) descended <to earth>, <it was> for this that he entered the virgin’s womb, <it was> for this that he endured being called a vagabond, an outcast and accursed, <it was> for this that he <endured> mockery, insults, being spat upon, being slapped and the cross itself.’ John used to say this and all the other things that the Holy Spirit gave his marvellous tongue alone the power to explain sufficiently. Next he said: ‘The Lord, who by a mere word of command gave physical existence to all things, did not refuse to do and to suffer such things to increase <the salvation of the church>. Shall we then puff ourselves up to such a point that we do not ourselves imitate even a little the care of the Lord for his servants in the case of our fellow-servants? What sort of excuse, what defence will we have?’ I will avail myself of the words of the blessed man on this point: <he said> ‘For this reason I want all things to be managed by my own right hand’ because he suspected that they had shown a certain neglect of the affairs of the church.⁶⁰

22 Like an excellent athlete who has come <to compete for> the crown of victory at some Olympic games,⁶¹ confident in both the healthy condition of his limbs and his skill in wrestling, submitting himself to the rule of the contests (to wait for the lot that pits the competitors against one another) and, after the previous competitors have been defeated by one another in

60 The speech appears to quote something that John himself said; we have transposed the indirect speech of the Greek into direct speech in English. John’s remark may contain an oblique allusion to Isaiah 41.10.

61 On the author’s fondness for athletic metaphors and similes, see Introduction, section 3. The famous games at Olympia in the Peloponnese were still being held every four years at the time when the *Funerary Speech* was delivered in autumn 407; they were only suppressed after 408 (*Scholia in Lucianum*, ed. H. Rabe [Leipzig, 1906], 176.3–6, 178.3–7), not in 393, as has often been asserted (see Barnes 2001, 341–42). But many cities in Asia Minor and the Levant, which had long held their own local Olympic Games, continued to hold them even into the sixth century (Barnes 2001, 342–45). It is to local Olympic Games that the speech refers. At Chalcedon, the Olympic Games held in the theatre were suppressed before 434/435, when Leontius attempted to revive them while he was prefect of the city of Constantinople (Callinicus, *Vita Hypatii* 13.1; cf. *PLRE* 2.669, Leontius 9).

each of the contests drawn by lot, wrestles down the last one left and thus receives the crown himself – and because he aims for glory to a greater degree and has confidence, as I just said, he would assign himself to himself by lot, alone taking up the contest against all comers, so that he alone might inherit the glory from the crown, in as much as none of those defeated could say that any contribution had been made by their efforts towards the fame which he derived from the crown and the proclamation <of his victory>,— so too this marvellous man, although he knew more than others that in the church some are assigned to be shepherds, others to teach, some to govern, others to assist (1 Corinthians 28; Ephesians 4.11), took on himself and stored up the prizes from all these functions and performed them all buoyed up by his own wisdom and the power of the <Holy> Spirit.

23 This would have been amazing and important in itself, but I think that what is now about to be said puts all of this into the shade because it is extraordinarily remarkable. What is this? The fact that, being in charge of such a great city, which one would not be wrong to call a whole world in miniature, which ten thousand tongues would not have sufficed to teach, nor an equal number of hands for recording what happens in it, nor many bodies and just as many souls for visiting the houses of all and <discovering> the various ideas of those in them, he did not think that so many and such diverse matters sufficed for himself alone because of the grace <which he had received>, but that the tasks which he had in hand were too small for his skill and that his experience was being slighted because it did not have an outlet to display its power. He restored order to the churches of distant bishops by doing exactly what a good farmer would do, who was rich in seed and farm implements, but had little land to work: he would rent the unused acres of his neighbours, increase his own wealth and alleviate their poverty, because their land, which was previously idle, was now bearing fruit through his exertions.⁶²

62 This agricultural metaphor and § 24 defend John against the charge that he improperly intervened in the neighbouring dioceses of Thrace, Asiana and Pontica where his opponents asserted that he had no jurisdiction (App. A; Theodoret, *HE* 5.28.2). The third canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381 had decreed that the eastern capital was the ‘new Rome’ and that its bishop was second only in honour to the bishop of Rome (Joannou 1962a, 47–48), but it is not clear what legal right it gave the bishop of Constantinople to intervene in other dioceses (Dagron 1974, 461–67; Kelly 1995, 108–09, 129–30; Tiersch 2002a, 19–30, 309–26). The legal situation was clarified in 451, when the Council of Chalcedon ruled that the bishop of Constantinople had the authority to ordain the metropolitan bishops of the civil dioceses of Thrace, Pontica and Asiana (*ACO* 2.1.3. 88–89 = Joannou 1962a, 90–93; Canon 28).

24 Or to speak in a different way, so that we may avoid reproach for using an image from the mundane commercial world: like a helmsman who has not taken up the profession under the compulsion of poverty,⁶³ perhaps also because of advancing age (<both of> which imperil the safety of the vessel), but rather <like> one in the prime of his youth, trained in the business⁶⁴ and vigorous in his body, in charge of a cargo ship carrying ten thousand measures, carried along by a favourable wind and steering the vessel skilfully, <who,> seeing others buffeted in the midst of a surging sea and losing their ships, some through the lack of necessary equipment, others through inexperience of what needs to be done, would by shouts and gestures teach the one group the required turn of the steering oars, and give the other rope or an oar, not hesitating <to supply> deckhands or tackle to those in need of them, then, having arrived with all the ships safe in the security of a harbour, would receive from them together with words of praise acknowledgements admitting to all that he was responsible for saving them, so that his pursuit of honour⁶⁵ on the high sea brings him universal applause in the harbour,—so too this marvellous man, seated on the very pinnacle of virtue and sailing with a fair wind wafted by the <Holy> Spirit, aided other bishops in their labours, relieving the poverty of some with money, building churches for others in both countryside and cities, if they happened to need them, providing others with a noble stock of monks, rescuing others from a dangerous proximity to heresies, liberating the cities and surrounding territory of others from the defilement of idols, correcting the manners of others if they needed it, rousing the lazy, the supine and those who cared nothing for the neglected life of their brothers to sober wakefulness, and instilling gentleness in those whose manner was rough, harsh and ready to lop off the feeble limbs <of the church>. Hence anyone who could not see <all> these things together would have said that this man was inconstant, changing the thrust of his words now this way, now that. <In fact,> however, he had one hope and prayer, to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ with all the churches in good repute.

25 As if the whole of our civilized world was not sufficient to occupy his pastoral care, he went into the land of the barbarians: he planted churches

63 John himself was fond of nautical metaphors and similes (Brottier 1994).

64 The vague phrase ‘in the business’ presumably means ‘in steering’.

65 The noun φιλοτιμία must here be an abstract noun used in its original etymological sense, even though its most common use under the Roman Empire had come to be as the equivalent of the Latin *munus* with the concrete meaning of ‘games/show’ (Robert 1994, 102).

now in Persia, now in the land of the Goths, using for this purpose whatever ministers the grace of the <Holy> Spirit suggested to him.⁶⁶

26 In fact, however, the most remarkable thing is that whatever men he found suitable for the oversight of churches, although many resolved to advise him to keep them close at hand in order to help him in his labours, he did not consider his own interests, but what was advantageous for the common good, and in every case he selected with <God's> grace and dispatched to cities the individual whom each <city> needed, imitating the best generals in this too. For just as generals, when they have obtained command of many cavalry and many infantry, emboldened by the courage of their own men rather than their numbers, for this reason have contempt for the attacks of the enemy and send all their subordinates away to guard distant cities or to ravage the enemy's territory, <while> they themselves unsheathe their swords, take up position on the walls, drive out all fear from their own side and banish all hope of victory from the minds of their opponents,— so too indeed did this most brave man, a most fearsome general against the demons, dispatch the chosen soldiers of Christ to distant parts to wage war against them through the destruction of temples and idols and through the planting of churches, for he knew that they were waging war equally on both fronts. He alone, taking in his hand his marvellous quiver, I mean that broad and great mind of his, using his tongue as his bow and his words as arrows, filled the demons with great confusion and despair, but his flocks with great security.

THE DEVIL PLOTS TO DESTROY JOHN

27 Do you not hear the facts crying out that the Devil could not have tolerated watching this with equanimity? For I, both through what I have said and through many great things that I have left out because of the feebleness of my speech, imagine the voice of the Lord saying to the Devil: 'You have considered my servant John, how blameless, just, truthful and devout he is, not only restraining himself from every wicked deed, but also swiftly following my every wish?' (cf. Job 1.8, 2.3) The Devil, who is shameless,

⁶⁶ John was unique in his era for his missionary work both in Persia and among the Goths (Theodoret, *HE* 5.31), which he continued even in exile (*Letter to Olympias* 14.5; *Epp.* 54, 126, 207, 221 [*PG* 52. 638–39, 685–87, 726–27, 732–33]; cf. Kelly 1995, 142–44, 260–63; Tiersch 2002a, 125–34).

said, I suppose: ‘Philosophy is a matter of mere words;⁶⁷ it is no big thing to talk big. He talks loftily, but when the time comes, his actions will not match his words, while those to whom he speaks hear but do not heed him and applaud as if they accept <his words>, but they only applaud and this is the only effect of his teaching on them. Lay hands on him and them, and then we shall see the power of his words on both.’ <I believe> that God, who knows all things before they come into being and who penetrates invisible realities, because he knew those who belonged to him and was emboldened by their resolve, gave the Devil power over the church for a little while (cf. Job 2.6).

28 But before I say anything about the events related to the disorder, I want to explain a few things for those who find fault with God’s long-suffering in such matters, so that they do not wittingly err because they are unwilling to scrutinize God’s arrangements with accuracy and pious reasonings. For I think that that saint will now all the more accept my speech and bind my encomium on his head like a crown, if someone were to intertwine with it a defence of the Lord: such great love for the divine used to blaze forth from his mind. What then do they say? ‘Why did God permit the Devil to exercise such power over the Church, when it was possible to punish him, to force him to be quiet and to preserve the Church pure from all disruption?’

29 Let us examine fully together this point, my good man,⁶⁸ whether unbroken quiet is wholly necessary or not, and I ask you: if there was at any time a rich man in a great city, who was granted the title of ‘father of the people’⁶⁹ by all because of the large number of his benefactions, who later, stimulated by an abundance of public spirit were to announce to the people that he would mount for them the spectacle of Olympic games⁷⁰ and were to spend much gold on assembling athletes, and, when they had gathered, were to put them in the charge of a fine trainer who was practised in every form of wrestling, and were to spare no expense in providing lodging and food to nourish their bodies in a state of good health and put the spectators themselves in control of the choice of competitors – if then they choose

67 We take this as a general (and familiar) statement, not one specifically about John.

68 On the tone of the indefinite vocative ἄνθρωπε, see Dickey 1996, 150–54; she concludes that in late Greek it ‘seems to have negative connotations even when used to unspecified addressees’.

69 An informal title; ‘father of the people’ seems not to be attested as a municipal title, though the official position of *pater civitatis* came into existence in some cities, though not all, in the middle of the fifth century (Roueché 1989, 77–79).

70 Only especially magnificent local games could be called ‘Olympic’ (as in § 22); see Barnes 2001, 342–45.

some barbarian displaying an uncouth body and appearance, who seems likely to overcome many not at all by his own strength, but rather by their laziness, and who will defeat many more because of their cowardliness and lack of skill, when the time comes and the barbarian strips in the middle of the arena, loudly denounces the benefactor and <himself> summons the athletes – would you then wish the president of the games, please tell me, out of fear for the defeat of some competitors, to dismiss the very courageous without crowns and to destroy the glory of both the athletes and the benefactor together on account of those who have not spent the preceding time on what was necessary and have not submitted themselves to the wisdom of the trainer? I think not. For this analogy brims over with both injustice and stupidity.

30 Now please follow my argument from the analogy to the truth, and you will see that the licence <given to the Devil> was much more just and necessary than quiet <would have been>. Consider: Being the fearsome Lord of all things, God rejoices in being called the father of all because of his love for humankind, and he has not ceased through all the ages bestowing generously on our nature many and great benefits all of which surpass our comprehension. For he created everything, although he had no reason to create except for his own goodness and our need. He loves the angels, using them to minister to salvation for the heirs of the promise. He hates the Devil, who is consumed with envy at the prosperity of our race, seeing <mere> clay held in such high esteem by the Lord and lifted on high (cf. Job 10.9), while he himself is degraded so much from his former rank. <God> has promised to the angels, out of his greater generosity,⁷¹ to show this incorporeal being, who is quick, full of guile and stuffed with arrogance, defeated and cast down by this clay. <God> has gathered together many athletes, establishing as their mark of honour the blood of his Firstborn, has given them the pledge of the Spirit (2 Corinthians 1.22; 5.5), and has allotted them a daily sustenance inaccessible to the angels.⁷² And after all the other things he has put in charge of them a fine trainer for such things – this saint.

31 When this man came, he taught all how great the care of the Lord is for us, how great the raging frenzy of the Devil is against us, what the rewards are of virtue, what the punishments are for wickedness, how wealth

⁷¹ This seems the most appropriate translation of φιλοτιμία here (contrast n.65): the *Speech* retains the athletic metaphor.

⁷² That is, the sacraments.

when unchosen⁷³ does not harm the soul, how poverty confers honour when chosen, how one ought to have a pure tongue that abides by oaths and how one should regard false oaths, how it is necessary to spend justly acquired wealth for the needs of those in want,⁷⁴ while barring one's door entirely to unjust wealth, how it is beneficial both to embrace poverty of one's own accord and to bear it nobly if it is involuntary, arguing that it will not be unrewarded if it remains without blasphemy. He expended countless words against the love of money, against drunkenness and its daughter, fornication the mother of death, against greed, against those obsessed with chariot-racing,⁷⁵ against those flocking to the theatres,⁷⁶ who did not in their own estimation believe that they were sinning greatly, but were doing this for some <supposed> betterment of their souls, without being aware that they were ruining rather than improving their souls, that they were exchanging eternal life for a small and useless pleasure, and that they were willingly letting themselves stray apart from the flock of Christ. He made all into lovers of singing psalms, through which they made the night day, the public square a church, and the church heaven.⁷⁷

32 When he saw this, the Devil became inflamed, and shouted against the Lord, claiming that the contest was no longer equal, but the matter was an act of violence, and that victory was accruing to them not because of their exertions, but by <divine> grace. The crowds of angels demanded from the Lord, I dare say, the spectacle of the contests!⁷⁸ And so after all these things would not those who have sense have called for the decisive moment even though it had not yet presented itself? I myself think so. 'But what did the

73 That is, inherited. The speaker alludes to Olympias, who funded many of John's charitable enterprises in Constantinople out of her vast wealth, which was inherited (*Life of Olympias* 3–5).

74 We have emended the transmitted 'hands' (χειρας) to 'needs' (χρείας).

75 The Greek means literally 'against those mad on horses'; the allusion is to the supporters of the different factions under which horse-driven chariots raced in the hippodrome of Constantinople (Cameron 1976, 24–73).

76 On 3 July 399 John preached his homily *Contra ludos et theatra* against those who had absented themselves from divine worship in order to attend precisely these two entertainments (CPG 4441.7: PG 56.263–70).

77 John intended these night services, which he termed ἀγρυπνίαι or παννυχίδες, as a way for men, who did not have leisure during the day, to pray; women were encouraged to pray at home during the day. According to Palladius, *Dial.* 5.146–50, these nocturnal prayers caused distress among the more lethargic clergy, but John himself describes them as highly successful in his 26th and 27th *Homilies on Acts* (PG 60.202, 203–04).

78 The Greek noun ἄγων is very frequently used of the hardships undergone by Christians, especially martyrs (Lampe 25).

contest,' he says, 'benefit those who fell?' I say that such people would not have stood their ground if the struggle had not taken place. They did not fall, they were refuted; they were not changed, they <merely> took off their masks. At the judgment which is to come we shall surely see many saying 'Lord, Lord, did we not cast out demons in your name, did we not prophesy in your name and perform countless miracles?' (Matthew 7.22). <We shall see them> hearing <a reply> from the voice of the Lord: 'I do not know you; go hence from me, you workers of iniquity, into the eternal fire' (Matthew 7.23, 25.41). So please tell me: do you want that terrible day not to come because of these people? But it will surely come, so that each will get the appropriate recompense, some for virtue, some for wickedness.

33 You then, having ceased to rejoice at the fact that young women and children of a tender age have in this way nobly wrestled to the ground and defeated the devil and have trampled on all his snares and schemes, sit crying over your grey head, which has been put to shame, even though it wears piety in the colour of its hair. And do you not see that youth has gladly been crowned and that it endures every injury on behalf of the truth? And do you wish pearls to be hidden away in the darkness and glass to be held in high esteem, deceiving the eyes of those who look on it? But the blessed Eutropius⁷⁹ will not tolerate hearing you saying these things, about whom alone is it just to pronounce that famous saying of Solomon, modifying it just a little: 'Many great and famous men have sat upon the ground, but an unexpected one has donned the crown of martyrdom.'⁸⁰

34 The crucial point which nearly escaped me by being omitted <is this>: in exchange for those toils and his loyalty towards the Lord, that saint asked constantly that a single recompense be made for him – to lose his life as a martyr. So since God, who is wise and resourceful, was fulfilling the prayer of the just man with all haste and was arranging just such an end for him, what else was left? For others to become his companions and in this matter <for him> to provide us in some way with an image of the day to come and of the confutation of those who think themselves to be something.

35 The Devil then, receiving authority over the church for the reasons I have mentioned, raged greatly against it, satisfying not an order from the Lord,

⁷⁹ Eutropius was a follower of John who was executed after the bishop's exile (§ 125); he should not be confused with the powerful eunuch Eutropius, the consul of 399 (*PLRE* 2.440–44, Eutropius 1).

⁸⁰ Slightly adapted from Ecclesiasticus 11.5: 'Many monarchs have been made to sit on the ground, and the person nobody thought of has worn the crown.'

but his own madness. Next he began to contemplate what sort of beginning he should make in the matter. Let no-one accuse my oration of stupidity, if we try to parade⁸¹ the arguments of the devil; for the wise Paul said that we are not ignorant of his intentions (2 Corinthians 2.11).

36 In his own reasoning, it seems likely that he said to himself: ‘What should I do? Am I to dangle before them the worship of idols? But they will laugh out loud and will instead all run gladly to martyrdom. But am I to set them to enmity and schism? But the teacher will quickly restore them to unity and will persuade them to remain at peace, as indeed he did earlier when I persuaded many to abandon him and to welcome the fellow who had come from Gabala, when he, out of anger and doing me a favour, uttered statements disparaging the presence on earth of the Galilean.⁸² So what seems better to me? To strike down the shepherd? For in that way his flocks would quickly be scattered (Zachariah 13.7).⁸³ In what way ought I strike that man down? By taking a sword and stabbing him? But that would be a release from his present distress that he would welcome. By trying to entrap him with the attractive bodies of women? But he looks at female beauty in the same way as he looks at statues in marble. Should I rob him of all that he owns and cast into penury one who is satisfied with a widow’s spelt bread? (1 Kings 17.11–14) Shall I afflict him with a grave wound? But he has been besieged by countless sufferings and never once has he refrained from speaking out.

What then is the greatest weapon that I think I have? The one with which I once persuaded Jezebel to destroy the famous Naboth (1 Kings 21.1–16). I already have among the presbyters instruments practised in the arts of slander, and I have a woman of that sort, whom I have taken prisoner through

81 The verb ἐκπομπεύω is another word greatly favoured by of John, who uses it 127 times out of a total of 190 in the whole *TLG* canon.

82 Although the Devil uses the derogatory term ‘the Galilean’ for Jesus, as Julian the Apostate had (e.g., *Ep.* 89b, 465), the main thrust of the sentence is to accuse Severianus of Gabala (§§ 17–18, with our notes) of insulting Christ and hence of heresy. The *Funerary Speech* alludes to an incident recorded by both Socrates and Sozomen (Kelly 1995, 183–86). According to a passage of Socrates, which he seems to have suppressed in a revised version of his history (*HE* 6.11.12–20, p. 331.12–25 Hansen), Severianus exclaimed to John’s archdeacon Sarapion (on whom, see Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 170–71 n.4), when the latter failed to stand when the former passed by, ‘If Sarapion dies a Christian, then Christ did not become a man.’ Sozomen reports a slightly different version of Severianus’ remark (*HE* 8.10.4: ‘If Sarapion die a clergyman, then Christ was not incarnate’).

83 John is here equated with Christ, since Matthew 26.31 repeats Zachariah 13.17 in the context of the Crucifixion.

her insatiable avarice, and who is invested with both power and wickedness, great wickedness.⁸⁴ <John> is very troublesome to this woman who views him with suspicion. Theophilus the Egyptian will collaborate with me in this business; for I watched him with pleasure when he opposed <John> at the start and stirred up countless plots to prevent him becoming bishop.⁸⁵ What he watched with displeasure as it happened then, he will surely be willing to undo with pleasure, now that he has gained in strength.’

37 Having collected the opinions of all these by letters, that master of evil the Devil, bent on speed, somehow himself became a mounted courier and bound them to one another with oaths, oaths which it would have been better to break than to abide by, and, after scattering his poison among them all, he sat back as a spectator to watch events as they unfolded, and to lend a helping hand wherever he might see them in need of his help.

THE PLOTTING OF THEOPHILUS⁸⁶

38 So when the power to do what he had long desired reached Theophilus, a man little inferior to the Devil by nature, but who possessed cunning in a much greater degree, he gathered together the bishops of the Egyptian churches, whom he had long so enslaved by terror and by constantly and illegally changing their sees that they acted at his mere command more readily than slaves who are shackled act out of necessity – bishops whose names were half-barbarian being formed out of the ancient abominations of Egypt, whose voice and language were completely barbaric, and whose character imitated their voice. Having forced them to embark on ships he dispatched them by the fastest route, saying nothing else than: ‘We are leaving to complete a necessary task.’ For he thought that those who were

84 The *Funerary Speech* presents the empress Eudoxia as largely responsible for John’s downfall and twice elsewhere also compares her to Jezebel (§§ 3, 138); for discussion, see Introduction, section 8.2–3.

85 Theophilus was bishop of Alexandria from 385 to 412; in 397 he had attempted to secure the election of his candidate, Isidore, in succession to Nectarius (Socrates, *HE* 6.2; Sozomen, *HE* 8.3).

86 Norman Baynes characterized Theophilus as ‘a man of violence who knew no scruple’ (1955, 105). For a corrective to the hostile interpretation put on all of Theophilus’ actions by ancient writers favourable to John, who have been followed by most modern scholars and historians of the church, see Russell 2007, 17–34. Our commentary on the *Funerary Speech* does not offer a critical reappraisal of its overall presentation of either Theophilus or John; it sets out only to elucidate specific allusions in the text.

far away, when they heard of the large number of bishops,⁸⁷ would no longer ask for delay so that the business be transacted justly, while he knew that these men would do everything that he himself might wish, even without knowing what they were doing. But his undertaking, full of evil cunning and wickedness, did not escape anyone's notice.

39 <Theophilus> himself followed them travelling overland,⁸⁸ scattering snares among the bishops of the many cities on his route through pestiferous men who would do anything for unjust gain, in order that he might have some to work with him in his inordinate madness, others ready to depose those who⁸⁹ were unwilling to do this. And then, having approached the strait from the Black Sea, whose flow divides the land between Bithynia and Thrace,⁹⁰ a crossing of a few stades, he remained there keenly awaiting the ships from Egypt.⁹¹ When those arrived, bringing a cargo of injustice⁹² and illegal wares <to sell>, with the father of envy⁹³ as their helmsman, <Theophilus> left these bishops in the territory of the Bithynians, where they conversed with one another like bleating sheep, while he himself set foot in Constantinople – how I will not say, for I am ashamed to say that sailors' chanting of psalms had taken place on land⁹⁴ – and bypassing the church, as one who had long ago become alien to it, he trotted around the houses of the wealthy.⁹⁵

87 Palladius, *Dial.* 3.11–13, reports that 29 of the 36 bishops who condemned John at the Council of the Oak were Egyptian; Theophilus had sent them to Constantinople by boat, presumably on the ships taking Egyptian grain to the capital (Sozomen, *HE* 8.14.5).

88 Sozomen, *HE* 8.14.5, confirms that Theophilus travelled overland (cf. Ommeslaeghe 1977, 402).

89 Before τοῦτο we have added the definite article τοῦς, which we believe has dropped out by haplography.

90 We punctuate after φερόμενον, not before (as Wallraff).

91 Theophilus was waiting at Chalcedon; the Egyptian grain fleet must have been delayed by adverse winds.

92 The phrase ἐμπορίαν παρανομίᾱς combines two nouns favoured by John, who used them more than 150 and 300 times respectively.

93 A common description of the Devil.

94 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.41, reports that when Theophilus entered Constantinople, he 'was greeted by a mob of sailors', who are identified as Egyptians from the grain fleet by Socrates, *HE* 8.15.11; Sozomen, *HE* 8.17.1. The *Speech* implies that there was something improper about these sailors' 'psalms'. Ricci suggests that the phrase is 'an idiomatic expression without any particular reference to the psalms'.

95 Both the *Speech* and Palladius are entirely silent about where Theophilus stayed when he came to Constantinople. John himself when writing to the bishop of Rome simply said that he lodged outside the city (*Letter to Innocentius* 32–33); in fact, he resided in the *Palatium*

40 Sounding out everyone's disposition towards the saint and inquiring secretly what sort of man they judged John to be in character, he heard some say that he was harsh, that he was impudent (for bad people call freedom of speech 'impudence'), that he barred their entry to the church with his sermons by discoursing against greed or avarice and directing the eyes of all to them with a shout. Others <he heard> lamenting that he did not allow their wealth to grow unjustly and that he resisted their seizures <of property> by both word and deed.⁹⁶ One among those who account themselves great, believe me, my friends, even found fault with his sermons against fornication, saying: 'By speaking of these things he encourages philanderers to approach our wives.' So greatly was this man convinced that his household was chaste!⁹⁷

41 Theophilus said to all these men: 'Why then do you bear his yoke against your will, when it is possible to shake it off easily, to live freely, to increase your property and to enjoy everything pleasantly?' When they received his proposal with pleasure and a plea <to act on it>,⁹⁸ he said: 'I will do everything; this is why I have come.' And having come to an interview with the woman who was then in power,⁹⁹ he both gave and received promises, promising that he would bring about <John's> deposition by every means, and receiving an undertaking that when he had done this he would not be disgraced or ever be brought to trial. He then crossed to the other side of the strait, wishing to use the sea as a defence against proof of his villainy.

42 What also pushed and drove him to the deed, it is unnecessary to pass over in silence. For this utter villain had driven out of the land of the Egyptians holy men who had pursued a solitary life almost from their very swaddling

Placidianum as a guest of the empress Eudoxia (Socrates, *HE* 6.15.12; Sozomen, *HE* 8.17.2; cf. Janin 1964, 134–35).

96 According to Palladius, *Dial.* 8.49–59, Theophilus spent three weeks gathering support for his plot among the gluttonous and ambitious with plentiful food and promises of promotion, all the while never once speaking to John.

97 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.76–90, 8.77, says that Severianus, Antiochus, Acacius and others 'who had a grudge against John for his moderate counsels' met in the house of the noble lady Eugraphia (who is known only from Palladius; *PLRE* 2.417) and that John had complained about the vanity of certain older women, saying: 'You grey-haired old women! At your age, why do you compel yourselves to make your bodies young again, wearing curly locks of hair upon your foreheads like common whores? You outrage the rest of free women, beguiling all you meet, some of you even widows to boot.'

98 The Greek has the colourless τὸ πρῶγμα, which does double duty; we have followed Ricci's interpretation of the sentence.

99 Eudoxia, in whose residence Theophilus was lodging (above, n.95).

clothes right up to the depths of extreme old age,¹⁰⁰ who had not even heard of any of the evils in cities, even though he had no charge to bring against them except that they had accepted into their lodgings when he came to them a man renowned for his piety, who had become a champion of the poor and was vouched for by all more than that famous Tabitha of old (Acts 9.36), but whom he had on the basis of no just charge ejected from <performing> the liturgy and the other duties with which he had been entrusted.¹⁰¹ These men were <thus> suffering persecution as a penalty for showing love towards a brother. Because of the excessive impiety <of Theophilus> they too arrived in the imperial city and asked the emperor to do them the favour of learning for what reason they had been driven out and had suffered what they were still suffering.¹⁰²

43 When the emperor sent them with an escort to a hearing before the bishop whom he summoned with letters, Theophilus, seeing that his affairs had come to rest on a razor's edge (for there had been added to the charges against him the murder of monks and the burning of monasteries), involved them in a false charge of heresy (and a certain Origen, from where I know not, suddenly began to be invoked for bogus reasons)¹⁰³ and strained every

100 These are the so-called 'Tall Brothers', a group of monks in Egypt led by one Isidore, whom Theophilus had excommunicated (Socrates, *HE* 6.7; Sozomen, *HE* 8.12; cf. Kelly 1995, 191–202). We cannot understand why some patristic scholars and historians call them the 'Long Brothers': the meaning 'tall' is perfectly well attested for the adjective *μακρός* from Homer onwards (LSJ 1073, s.v. I.2).

101 That is, the monk Isidore, to whom the Tall Brothers gave refuge in Egypt when he was excommunicated by Theophilus (Socrates, *HE* 6.7.27–29; Sozomen, *HE* 8.12.2). According to Palladius, *Dial.* 6.41–139, Theophilus had become jealous of Isidore, who had been his candidate for the see of Constantinople in 397 (Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 130–31 n.2), when Isidore became the beneficiary of a donation of 1,000 gold coins from a wealthy widow, and trumped up charges against him.

102 According to Palladius, *Dial.* 8.9–22, the Tall Brothers appealed to Eudoxia at the shrine of St John in Constantinople and asked that their case be investigated by the prefects, i.e., the praetorian prefect of the East and the prefect of the city of Constantinople, while Theophilus should be summoned to stand trial before John. Socrates, *HE* 6.9.9, and Sozomen, *HE* 8.13.3, report only that the monks approached the emperor and John.

103 Palladius, *Dial.* 6.128–34, also suggests that Theophilus devised the charge of Origenism (whatever precisely he meant by that) against the Tall Brothers in order to distract attention away from the charges against him. Both the *Speech* and Palladius omit the fact that Epiphanius, the bishop of Salamis, had tried some months earlier, probably at Theophilus' urging, to bring charges of Origenism against the Egyptian monks and had also accused their protector, John, of the same alleged heresy (Kelly 1995, 203–10). On the silence of contemporaries on any theological dimension of the conflict between Theophilus and John, see Elm 1998.

nerve to depose the saint before he took any legal steps against him, in appearance doing this to oblige others, but in truth trying to liberate himself from fear and anguish.

44 Just as a man aiming at a *coup d'état* concentrates on gathering together and befriending those who because of their evil characters are distressed by a situation of quiet, but are nourished by strife, revolution and violent and irrational governments, <all of> which promise debtors relief from their debts, slaves their freedom and the poor an opportunity to acquire resources, and, preparing his armed insurrection through such men, dreams of ruling – so too then this man, having gathered together those who had long ago been expelled from the clergy and those under indictment on charges of utmost gravity, and many others who had obtained money to spend on the needs of churches, but had spent it on caring for their own stomachs, having persuaded them all that he would clear them of blame and having set up some of them as accusers and others as false witnesses,¹⁰⁴ he departed with them to the other side <of the strait>, took up residence there with those Egyptian bishops whom I have mentioned and held a mock-council.¹⁰⁵ For he was as far from wishing <a real council> to take place as a person who avoids attending a court of law out of a desire to lose his case.

45 Associated with <Theophilus> in his plan were also three bishops from Syria: Acacius of Beroea, and Severianus and Antiochus,¹⁰⁶ the names of whose cities local passers-by did not trouble themselves to learn, while those who were inside <the council>¹⁰⁷ frequently asked where their cities might be. One of these (I am speaking of Acacius) had the following motive for hating the saint. Once when he came <to Constantinople>, large and splendid lodgings had not been prepared for him. In fact, such a lodging had indeed been prepared, but it was not what he wanted, and lodgings to the bishop's liking would have been ready, had not one of the priests already taken possession of it, who refused, or rather was unable, to move from it

104 Theophilus is reported to have employed two deacons whom John had expelled from his clergy for murder and fornication to traduce his character (Palladius, *Dial.* 8.63–75; cf. Socrates, *HE* 6.15.5; Sozomen, *HE* 8.17.4).

105 The so-called Council of the Oak (App. A).

106 Severianus and Antiochus, whom the *Speech* names here for the first time, were the bishops of Gabala in Syria Prima and Ptolemais in Phoenicia respectively; on their relations with and actions against John, see nn. 55, 82, 97, 177, 187, 194, 223, 224.

107 The paradosis offers ἔνδον ἐν αὐταῖς, which Wallraff prints; we believe that either ἐν αὐταῖς is a mistaken gloss on ἔνδον or that one or more words have accidentally fallen out of the text after the phrase.

with sufficient speed. The old man held this against our father as a lack of hospitality which could bring about his deposition.¹⁰⁸ The others <acted because> by using his sermons not to flatter the ears as they <did>, but rather to nourish souls, <John> had completely deprived them of the opportunity to make money, and because, having resolved to say something earlier at the time of the famine <of words>¹⁰⁹ and imagining that because of this they could control that church, they thought that now, once our father had been expelled, they would fully realize that unlawful and insane desire. Coming together therefore they made a fine chariot of intrigue with the Devil's hands driving its team of horses of illegality.

46 Wanting first to strip him of the goodwill of the emperor, but not having the means to attempt this, they were forced to fall back on a ridiculous charge, and invented a slander against him on a matter that in fact made especially conspicuous to all his supreme capacity for freely telling the truth. What is this? I will not hesitate to tell you.

JOHN AND GAINAS¹¹⁰

47 There was among the Romans a certain deserter from the barbarians, who seemed to deserve pity to judge from his appearance then, but who had a crooked character and was clothed in those first garments of sin (Genesis 3.21).¹¹¹ Through the magnanimity of the man who was emperor at the time, who thought it no great achievement for an emperor merely to refrain from killing a deserter, but that it was a great <achievement> to make the prosperity of deserters in a foreign land surpass what it was in their homeland, so that this fact might become a bait for those who had remained behind, this man

108 Palladius, *Dial.* 6.9–14, also identifies this incident, which he places in the previous year, as the source of Acacius' hostility towards John.

109 Ricci glosses 'the author refers to the famine of words' of §§ 1, 17; we have added her gloss to our translation, and deduce that the *Speech* alludes to John's absence in Asia in the winter of 401/402 (Introduction n.168).

110 The principal narrative sources, which for the most part we do not cite individually for specific points, are Socrates, *HE* 6.6, who drew on the lost *Gainea*, an epic poem by the *scholasticus* Eusebius, a pupil of the sophist Troilus who was in Constantinople in 399–400 (*PLRE* 2.429, Eusebius 8); Theodoret, *HE* 5.32–33; Sozomen, *HE* 8.4; Zosimus 5.7.4–6; 5.13–22; John of Antioch, frags. 187, 190 Müller = frags. 280, 282, 284 Roberto.

111 That is, tunics made of animal skin; around 400 the wearing of animal skins was regarded as a salient characteristic of barbarians (Cameron and Long 1993, 99).

advanced through important appointments to the highest office, and he was even sent to guard the city with a large number of troops.¹¹²

48 Succeeding beyond his deserts (such a thing normally induces stupid behaviour in those who lack sense), having offered a suppliant olive branch to secure his own safety and having acquired, along with safe conduct, command over so many troops, he plunged headlong into a passion for usurping supreme power. He first plundered the cities which he had been appointed to guard, then he crossed over to <attack> neighbouring cities as if about to set foot in the imperial city itself with the same intention, unless those in power did everything speedily that he himself might order. He gave orders to expel some high officials and install others, to send some into exile in disgrace and for the property of others to be seized unjustly, refusing to take or receive the plea of anyone.¹¹³ For the combination of barbarian and tyrannical purpose combined to persuade their possessor to do and order

112 On Gainas' career, to which the *Speech* refers without distinguishing carefully between its successive stages, see Cameron & Long 1993, esp. 7–8, 112–119; 161–175; 201–233; 316–328; Kelly 1995, 151–163. Both draw on Cameron 1988, which rendered *PLRE* 1.379–380 and Liebeschuetz 1990, 48–125, partly out of date. For the convenience of readers, and to clarify the allusions in §47, we summarise Gainas' career as far as his appointment as *magister utriusque militiae* in the summer of 399.

A Goth from north of the Danube, Gainas joined the Roman army after being welcomed as a Roman subject by the emperor Theodosius (cf. § 50), who gave him rapid advancement because of his military talents and abilities. In 394, together with the Alan Saul (*PLRE* 1.809) and the Iberian prince Bacurius (*PLRE* 1.144), Gainas commanded the barbarian contingents in the army of Theodosius which invaded Italy and defeated the forces of the general Arbogast and the usurper Eugenius. In the following year Gainas commanded the troops who returned to the East, and he was instrumental in the brutal assassination of the praetorian prefect Rufinus outside the walls of Constantinople on 27 November 395. Gainas' activities during the next three years are unknown, though in 399 he still held the rank or title of *comes*, which he had presumably received in or before 394. In 399 Gainas was appointed first joint, then sole commander of the troops sent to suppress the rebellion of his fellow-Goth Tribigild in Phrygia. Either then or after he defeated Tribigild and ended the revolt, he was promoted to the post of *magister utriusque militiae*, that is, one of the supreme military commanders in the East.

113 This chapter compresses together four separate episodes. The accusation that Gainas 'plundered the cities which he had been appointed to guard' refers to his suppression of the revolt of Tribigild in Phrygia. Gainas then marched on Constantinople ('the imperial city'), and in August 399 compelled the emperor to dismiss his chief minister and consul of the year, the powerful eunuch Eutropius. It was only in April 400, however, that Aurelianus, the consul of that year, the retired general Saturninus, who had been consul in 383, and the *comes* Johannes, who was a favourite of Eudoxia, were surrendered to Gainas as hostages (Socrates, *HE* 6.6.9; Sozomen, *HE* 8.4.5; Zosimus 5.18.8; John of Antioch, frag. 190 Müller = frags. 282, 284 Roberto; cf. Cameron and Long, 1993, xii, 161–75).

everything as if in a blind rage.¹¹⁴ Since no-one was willing to speak out <openly> because of a desire for quiet, he was persuaded with oaths to come and to appear before the emperor after receiving command over all the armies as a reward for his boldness.¹¹⁵ And he himself continued to do everything that he wanted on the written authority of the emperor.

49 Being such a sort of a man, he had as an addition to his madness worship in the manner of Arius.¹¹⁶ Those viper's offspring¹¹⁷ approached him as one who could do everything that he wanted, and was in complete control of the whole Roman state, in the guise of ambassadors, and persuaded him to make a request of the emperor on the strength of his obedience and to obtain through his authority one or more churches within the walls <of Constantinople>. For the piety of earlier emperors had by means of laws driven out the conventicles of all heresies from the city.¹¹⁸ He, not thinking the task to be onerous, instructed them to say which church they wanted to receive, gave them his promise and told them that preparations should be made for the inauguration. When the following day dawned, he submitted the request to the emperor, both wishing to be a persuasive advocate and as one roused to action by piety rather than self-aggrandisement. He claimed that it was not just that the general of the whole Roman Empire went outside

114 Lampe 1241–42 lists several metaphorical meanings of the phrase ἐν σκοτομῇνῃ: they all derive from its literal use in Psalm 10[11].2, where it means 'in the dark'.

115 The 'reward for his boldness' was Gainas' appointment as *magister utriusque militiae* in 399 (Socrates, *HE* 6.6.1; Theodoret, *HE* 5.32.1; Sozomen, *HE* 8.4.5), but the imperial audience to which the *Speech* alludes here should be the occasion on which John opposed Gainas' request for a church inside the city of Constantinople in which his Gothic soldiers might worship. Synesius alludes to John's opposition to the request at the end of the first book of his *On Providence* (115B Terzaghi; translated by Cameron and Long 1993, 378; cf. 191–92) and Theodoret praised it in the first of his lost speeches on the restoration of John's relics to Constantinople in January 438 (App. B). For a sceptical appraisal of the account of the episode in Theodoret, *HE* 5.32.2–8 and Sozomen, *HE* 8.4.7–9, see Liebeschuetz 1990, 190. Palladius is silent and Socrates, *HE* 6.5.8, introduces it with the dismissive remark that 'there is a story that etc.' (λόγος δὲ ὅτι κτλ.).

116 Like most Goths, Gainas accepted the homoean creed adopted by the Council of Constantinople in January 360, which is what counted as being an 'Arian' thereafter; Sozomen, *HE* 8.4.6, characterizes Gainas as 'a Christian of the heresy of the barbarians, who accept the opinions of Arius'.

117 The phrase is adapted from the words of Jesus (Matthew 3.7, 12.34, 23.1; Luke 3.7) and here designates heretical Christians.

118 Theodosius had expelled the homoean bishop Demophilus two days after he entered Constantinople on 24 November 380 (Socrates, *HE* 5.7.10, 12.6; cf. Marcellinus 380; *Chr. Pasch.* 561 Bonn = p. 60 Whitby and Whitby).

the city to pray, especially since it was so rich in houses of prayer: 'Please, emperor, allow one church be set apart for me and my priests to perform prayers <to God> on behalf of your rule.' The emperor bade him say this again on the following day in the presence of the bishop, summoned the saint and entrusted him with authority to settle the matter. <Gainas>, though he considered it an insult for a man so powerful to ask for any favour from an unarmed man, discovered that the saint was much more powerful than his own weapons.

50 For, having entered with a large number of bishops who were trembling and begging him to say nothing that would offend the barbarian, but were nonetheless emboldened by the justice of their cause and the wisdom of the man, <John> held in his hands the laws concerning this matter and delivered a long speech in the emperor's presence, so that he could say with the blessed David that 'I spoke in testimony on your behalf before kings and was not ashamed' (Psalm 118 [119].46). When the barbarian began to bluster against him in what he thought was the language of the Italians, which he had acquired as a foreign tongue and was not able to use articulately, the saint switched languages and thus deluged him with Italian words,¹¹⁹ calling him a tyrant and an enemy of the emperor and reminding him of his native land, his flight, his trembling, his pleas as a suppliant, and that unexpected safety and the oaths, which he sealed with a drink at that time, persuading the emperor who had written these things (showing him the law)¹²⁰ to preserve goodwill towards himself, his children and his descendants, with the result that the barbarian obtained preferment,¹²¹ although his character deserved exile and death. I have not, however, now set out to narrate that man's story,¹²² but the freedom of speech of our father, which is why I have

119 John had presumably acquired some knowledge of and ability to speak Latin in his youth when he studied with Libanius in preparation for entering the imperial civil service (Kelly 1995, 14–16).

120 The 'law' is presumably the original letter of appointment as a *comes* which the emperor Theodosius gave Gainas in the name of the whole imperial college at the time, that is, himself, his elder son Arcadius, whom he had proclaimed Augustus on 19 January 383, and, depending on the date, his younger son Honorius, whom he proclaimed Augustus on 23 January 393.

121 Literally, 'this appointment'.

122 The *Funerary Speech* deliberately omits the final stages of Gainas' career, which are most clearly set out by Cameron and Long, whose systematic analysis of the evidence of Synesius' *De Providentia* supersedes all earlier accounts (1993, 199–336). On 12 July 400, as a result of growing tensions between his Goths and the civilian populace, Gainas ordered his men to evacuate Constantinople. A rumour that the Goths planned to sack the city caused a panic, and the civilians of the imperial capital massacred all the Goths whom they found within

brought these things before you.¹²³

51 The great liars said that the saint wanted to make a present of the affairs of both church and empire together to <Gainas> and their allegations were persuasive.¹²⁴ This is not at all surprising, since, even when the blessed David was still holding in his hands the head and the sword of Goliath as his benefactor, he was judged before Saul to be a traitor and was driven away <as an outlaw> (1 Samuel 17–19). Those men brought a similar false accusation against our father before the rulers which, as I have already said, was absurd, lacking any reason and in fact the opposite. For, if someone had composed a speech containing an encomium of one who had cleansed the Roman state of such a stain,¹²⁵ and then came wanting to deliver it, no-one else would have been a more appropriate recipient of his speech than this blessed man. For the actions of this man were so pure that many heard the barbarian saying, both when he was still in the city and when he had begun his flight, ‘I did not destroy the bishop John to avoid this being counted as martyrdom for him; for had he himself not been so besotted with this, he would not have attempted such a daring act.’

THE TRIAL OF JOHN AND HIS FIRST EXILE¹²⁶

52 When they realized that those who had already become <John’s> enemies inside the city and had long been warring with him, though they

the city walls. When Gainas then withdrew to Thrace, he was declared a public enemy and the Goth Fravitta, who replaced him as *magister utriusque militiae per Orientem*, hunted him down and defeated him in the Chersonnese. Although Gainas escaped, he was defeated and killed in February 401 by a group of Huns under Uldin, who sent his severed head to Constantinople, where it was exhibited on a pole (Marcellinus 400, 401.1).

123 John’s bold speech against Gainas is also recorded by Theodoret, *HE* 5.32.5–8; Sozomen, *HE* 8.4.8.

124 On his enemies’ misrepresentation of John’s contacts with Gainas, see Kelly 1995, 162.

125 Another favourite word of John: according to the *TLG*, he uses the noun λόγος 355 times out of a total of 2,286 occurrences in the whole canon.

126 On the so-called Council of the Oak, see esp. Ubaldi 1903; Kelly 1995, 211–27; Tiersch 2002a, 327–54. We translate Photius’ summary of its proceedings in App. A; the nickname of the council derives from the fact that it convened at Chalcedon across the strait from Constantinople in the suburb known as ‘the Oak’ where Rufinus, the praetorian prefect of Theodosius, built a palace (Janin 1964, 150–51, 497–97, 504). Both the *Funerary Speech* and Palladius, *Dial.* 8.91–255, followed by Socrates, *HE* 6.15; Sozomen, *HE* 8.17, suggest that the council lasted only a short time.

appeared to be the weaker party, were in fact the stronger because of his extreme freedom of speech, they became eager <to act>. And there occurred something, my friends, which imitated the imaginary world of dreams. For the one who had come to give an account of the monasteries that he had burned down and of the monks whom he had expelled,¹²⁷ summoned those who had been wronged to a truce at once and began to talk effusively about letting bygones be bygones and to the effect that: 'If you are offering your gift of sacrifice at the altar, first embrace reconciliation with your brother and then sacrifice' (Matthew 5.23–24). <Theophilus> was merciful to his own misdeeds and, disregarding the command 'Thou shalt not kill the innocent and the just' (Exodus 23.7) as if it were <no more important than> the commandment about observing the Sabbath,¹²⁸ hastened on to murder.

53 As if he were judge, the one who was due to be judged summoned the judge to listen to charges and defend himself against them as if he was himself about to be put on trial. The saint sat deliberating about clemency and devising a way by which he might be able to free himself from those accusations. But the other, full of the intentions of a Cain, summoned him to the plain (Genesis 4.8). And what was most ridiculous, <Theophilus> made use of the clerics of <John's> church as assistants in <serving> the summons against him: with such great stupidity was he filled in addition to his shamelessness. The summonses were so continuous that the first, second, third and fourth occurred in a single day.

54 For I will not omit this, which perhaps now seems to be pointless to the many, but which is a most obvious proof of their madness. I will explain it very clearly. Since they knew about the case only by hearsay, to defend themselves in the eyes of those who had come from a distance, they sat and invented certain images and imitations of all the normal procedures of a Council – accusers, formal summoning and deposition. Hence they needed a judgment by default, and so made their procedure ready for themselves in either event: if <John> crossed the strait, they intended not to allow him to say anything or to open his mouth, since his way would be blocked by young hooligans using physical violence and abuse (for they were surrounded by a large number of hired thugs); on the other hand, if he did not cross the water, they intended to depose him as if they were following the laws of the church.

55 They gave the order to depose the one who was summoned to judgment

127 A polemical periphrasis for Theophilus.

128 Which Jesus had set aside (Matthew 12.1–8; Mark 2.23–28; Luke 6.1–5).

by the council and was unwilling to come. And they gave the order on the grounds that first, no small amount of time had been spent on the matter; second, that the charges and the accusers were made clear to the accused; third, that some judges were being rejected and others installed by the choice of the defendant; and on top of all these points that <both> the bishops who were gathering for this purpose from not too far away¹²⁹ and those who had <already> assembled were free of the stain of any accusation. They, passing over all this because, as I have already said, they did not expect ever to render an account of their actions to anyone, chose to use the summons alone.¹³⁰ And lest, if a delay occurred, a crowd of just bishops might arrive from somewhere and expose their outrageousness, they wanted to get the blow in quickly. So they sent men to issue the summonses one after another and, striving, I suppose, to display concern¹³¹ for their victim, they exceeded the clemency of those laws which prescribe that a third summons be made and issued an additional fourth summons, though they were quickly put to shame by the unpredictability of the winds and the journey-time of the ferries, the last summons arriving before the third.¹³²

56 The saint laughed as he observed these things happening. Holding fast to proper procedure, he dispatched some of the clergy who had remained with him (for <Theophilus> had succeeded in dragging all <the rest> across <the Bosphorus> by means of edicts containing the threat of deposition against those who did not obey) and some of the bishops to serve as emissaries and to argue persuasively that he would never avoid judgment because of a bad conscience, but that he wanted to know the charges and to learn who his accusers were and whether the bishops assembled were sufficient in number

129 We have translated Wallraff's text to the best of our ability, but it would give better sense to delete the phrase *μη σφόδρα πόρρωθεν* as a mistaken gloss which attempts to explain the redundant and artificial antithesis between bishops who had already arrived in Chalcedon and bishops who had not yet completed their journeys.

130 The mss. offer *μόνον* (KL) and *μόνην* (MP); Wallraff prints the former; we prefer the latter.

131 For the wide range of meanings of *φιλανθρωπία* at this date, see Lampe 1475–76. John uses the noun more than two thousand times.

132 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.145–225, records only two summonses, but Sozomen, *HE* 8.17.10, confirms that there were in fact four, although only three were technically necessary. In Roman law, a guilty plea needed to be repeated three times, and the requirement was taken over by the Christian church: the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions* specify that a bishop must be summoned three times before he can be condemned *in absentia* (Joannou 1962b, 45–46; Canon 74; cf. Ommeslaeghe 1977, 406–07). The fourth summons was doubtless intended to forestall any subsequent appeal against John's deposition on procedural grounds.

to hear the case adequately; for to choose to be judged by a mere quartet of bishops who were his avowed enemies was the height of stupidity.¹³³ The envoys, however, even before they had managed to state by whom they had been sent, received such physical mistreatment, some being punched, some being kicked, and yet others being beaten with cudgels on the head, that some abandoned their embassy out of fear, fell at the knees of the ringleader of the assembly and joined the other party,¹³⁴ although others had greater concern for their souls than their bodies. When they had returned with difficulty, they narrated what had happened and persuaded the saint to remain quiet and to accept the results of violence.

57 Couriers and imperial notaries¹³⁵ continuously rushed to and fro urging <John> to cross over to them and the others to arrive at a decision quickly, which they also desired to do. When they learned that he would not cross over to them on such a ‘settlement’ of matters or rather <in such conditions of> disturbance, uproar and civil strife, and when they had contrived what they contrived (we do not know what),¹³⁶ they nevertheless reported explicitly to the emperor’s house that the deed <specified> in their promises had been successfully completed, whereas the imperial side remained to be performed – I mean the expulsion of the saint from his church by any means. They too were not remiss in the matter of these agreements; on the contrary, the commander of a military detachment¹³⁷ at once came with the men under his command and carried out his duty of informing the just man of his deposition and persecuting him.

58 <John> stood up, raised his hands to the sky and uttered the words of the blessed Stephen, which have, I think, warded off the anger of God from the heads of those men even until today. Saying ‘Forgive them, Lord, for this

133 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.163–86, reports that in addition to John’s own response to the summons, the forty or so bishops who were with him in his residence in Constantinople composed their own stinging reply which quoted Theophilus’ letter to John (Introduction, section 7.2) and invited him either to instruct John’s accusers to observe the laws of the church or to drop their accusations and attacks on John.

134 The intimidation of John’s emissaries is noted by Palladius, *Dial.* 8.226–30; Sozomen, *HE* 8.22.6–8.

135 Literally, ‘those who take down the utterances of the emperor on tablets’; on the imperial *notarii*, see esp. Teitler 1985, 19–26.

136 The parenthesis ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐδὲ ἴσμεν would surely have been omitted by a more competent orator.

137 He was a *comes* according to Palladius, *Dial.* 9.1–3. Hence Wallraff is mistaken in identifying him as the Valerianus whom Palladius calls a *praepositus numeri* and *tribunus* when describing events of 405 (*Dial.* 4.36, 57; cf. Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 89 n.6).

sin' (Acts 7.60), he departed taking great care to avoid the attention of the people as he left. Thus the church became bereft of its shepherd.¹³⁸

59 I am convinced that the sky, the sun, the earth and the sea, if anyone had granted them a small capacity for feeling, would then¹³⁹ have groaned mightily together for the pain of the church. When those agents of destruction had inflicted this on it, as if they had achieved something important and admirable, they came into <the church> to celebrate a festival of both grief and pleasure – of pleasure for the adulterers, of grief for the widowed <church>. Do you think that I was willing to be silent about what they first did after that illegal act when they entered the city, the first of their other acts, but the second after that? One who rushes past this in silence will act not like those who compose encomiums of our father, but like those who rob him of them: he will earn the greatest gratitude from those <evil> men by casting a veil of silence over their undertaking, which alone would gratify the ears of those who love Christ so that they might learn precisely and <thus> avoid the perversity of those men.

Since my subject involves both praise of our father and recrimination against those men, the one with a sense of loss conjoined to it, the other giving birth to anger out of indignation, what do you wish that I should say first, what second? I think first what relates to our father, for in this way my speech will have logical coherence and we shall attack them more clearly by making the works of evil seem all the greater in comparison with virtue.

JOHN'S CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES AND HIS RECALL¹⁴⁰

60 What then <do I wish to say> in addition to all that I have said? It is necessary for us to plunge again into the ocean of the good deeds of the saint. For example, he wished everything to be managed by his right hand;

138 John departed into exile quietly in order to avoid further accusations and rioting by his disconsolate followers (Socrates, *HE* 6.15.21; Theodoret, *HE* 5.34.4; Sozomen, *HE* 8.18.2); indeed, in his *Letter to Innocentius* John implies that he left the city by ship on the same evening as he was informed of his deposition (93–97). The inflammatory homily which John is alleged to have delivered between his condemnation and his departure from Constantinople (*CPG* 4397) is spurious (Introduction, section 7.1).

139 We punctuate before τότῃ, not after with Wallraff.

140 Ricci heads this section of the *Speech* 'John's activities in exile and his recall to Constantinople.' But §§ 60–63 describe John's charitable activities before he was condemned by the Council of the Oak, to which § 64 alludes.

he considered that many great practical matters are nothing in comparison with experience stored up in the mind; he joined in assisting all the other bishops in their labours; he was unwilling to neglect the salvation even of the barbarians; he was fighting with all his might against the enemy of our salvation, now driving out impiety by the destruction of temples and idols, now introducing piety by the planting of churches; he alleviated poverty for those lacking in money and in all the other things that you have heard are not valueless. He wanted his successes to remain immortal until the end of time, so that, as generation succeeds generation,¹⁴¹ he might himself, even when absent, by his works play some part in benefactions for people in the future. If we attempted to test this in each of his actions, my speech would be extended to a great length.¹⁴² As it is, after we have shown that he expended such great effort on his love of the poor, which is especially dear to Christ (for our purpose requires <discussion of> this topic to refute the madness of those men), I will pass on to the narration of events.

61 Seeing that among all the poor some were maintained from church funds,¹⁴³ while others had no share in this assistance because they had other opportunities for earning income, unless they wanted to live in idleness, from having bodies that were still rather strong and youthful, and others bore the yoke of penury with difficulty because of wounds, illnesses or mutilated limbs, and for this very reason induced all who passed by to <show> generosity towards them, since a natural sympathy impelled those who saw them to charity, with the result that the unhealthy state of their bodies was necessary for the relief of their need—

leaving all these men aside to be treated as a subject for preservation by the charitable supplies of the church, he lavished practically all his own tender affection on those who were subject to the so-called sacred disease.¹⁴⁴ This disease, I think, acquired its name from the fact that it surpasses every

141 We read γεγενῶν with P against the γενῶν of the other mss., which Wallraff prints.

142 The Greek has a mixed conditional: εἰ ... ἐπιχειροῖμεν (optative), ...ἐκταθήσεται (future indicative). On the use of the optative in the *Funerary Speech*, see Introduction, section 3.

143 On institutional Christian support for the poor in the time of John, see recently Finn 2006, 34–89, 116–75; Holman 2008, 11–12; Brändle 2008; Mayer 2008b; Walsh 2008. Finn 2006, 151–55, documents John's promotion of regular almsgiving in his homilies. §§ 62–64 are the fullest surviving account of John's hospice for lepers.

144 Although 'the Sacred Disease' (ἡ ἱερὰ νόσος) commonly refers to epilepsy, it must here denote leprosy (Bayer 1950, 1026–28; Aubineau 1975, 87–88; Lascartos 1996; Miller and Nesbitt 2005). Palladius, *Dial.* 5.130–39, confirms that John used episcopal funds to found his hospice. In the Palladius passage we believe that Malingrey was wrong to treat the words μάλιστὰ δὲ τὴν ἱερὰν καλουμένην ('especially what is called the sacred <disease>') as a later gloss.

human misfortune and suffering. For it is truly a most grievous disease, a disease both pitied and hated, a disease that drives even a soul of steel to pity, but that scares away even the most philanthropic soul whenever it is necessary to touch the body of the invalid, a disease that dissolves the tie of kinship and overturns the bond of friendship, a disease that deprives those in its thrall of both pleasure from life and the release that comes from death, by making life distasteful and prolonging death, a disease that needs many to care for it, but at the same time is deprived of all. For, in addition to the other evils, the Devil who hates mankind has sown in everyone suspicion against his afflicted brothers, so that they think that the disease is a sort of reptile which is transmitted to those who enter the presence of those who have it, with the result that in unison all the human beings who inhabit the earth, both in cities and villages, have forbidden sufferers to set foot in their houses, marketplaces, baths or cities. And if anyone has an infected child, these arrangements apply to the child of his flesh as long as he lives; if anyone has a brother, a friend or a member of his household <who is infected>, he imposes these rules on him together with everyone else as soon as the disease has begun, and the assumption that one will also catch the disease extinguishes even the flame of affection which nature has lit.

62 The blessed man saw many among these stricken in the land of the Bithynians, abandoned on the highways, dead but unburied, moving corpses, bags of bones crawling along, people capable of speech who emitted inarticulate sounds and showed by their features just enough for those who saw them to know that they were once human beings. He drenched his cheeks with streams of tears and said to those who were with him: 'What could one do to alleviate so great a misfortune for these brothers?' When they said that one should give them a little money and then withdraw even from their sight, he said that this is what an ordinary person would do, and he began to put in motion a plan to provide houses for those who were homeless and to develop assistance for those living in cities by both the large size of the building and the large number living together – for he said that he wanted to set up a home for one thousand in number who were afflicted with this disease, not because he accommodated only this number in his thinking, but because there were not more on the earth who were fighting such misery – and he planned <to provide> revenues sufficient for all of them for all time by grants of land, taking into account their fathers' property in the case of those who had been cast out from their ancestral homes because of physical necessity (not only those then in that state, but also anyone else who might

at any time be constrained by such a shackle), so that such a one might be able to find refuge in a lodging as if it were his own, which he had purchased from his misfortune. Having banished every delay from his mind, <John> made the end of his thought the beginning of his actions. Finding a place for sale that was most abundantly suitable for the purpose – for it happened to have the finest air and a river flowing by that would be useful to them for cleaning the pus out of their sores –, he bought that place and instantly started work on the foundations.

63 He was greeted with a civil war, because the Devil stirred up countless troubles in order to avoid receiving so great a blow, if those who were being attacked by him had their sufferings alleviated just a little. For, as if the disease had already touched them, those who happened to be owners of nearby properties began to protest that they had been most mightily wronged, on the grounds that, although the river had made their land more fertile before, it was now suspected that it would bring the disfiguration of those <lepers> to them – cowards <that they were> for their suspicion and pitiful for their cowardice. For they ought to have rendered thanks to God that they were spectators only of other people's misfortunes without experiencing them themselves. But they detested and shunned the water that rinsed out the wounds of human bodies, although it was not dammed up in any place, but constantly by the flow of its current both showed and concealed from view what offended.¹⁴⁵ Accordingly, calming their anger with speeches about Gehenna and the kingdom of heaven, he let those who did not want to be persuaded do and say what they wanted, while he himself moved every skilled hand to the project.

64 When the building was reaching the roof of the second floor, the Devil roused his sympathizers to hasten to destroy the one who was constructing such buildings. Although they had not yet succeeded in writing the final letter of the document of illegality, they dispatched messengers to halt the work and ordered that those entrusted with this task should with all speed bring back to them the money which was being spent on it. Even now the building stands roofless, making all who see it open their mouths both to praise and exalt <John> for his love of his fellow men and to curse <those who opposed him> for their love of money.

65 Is it then possible (if anyone among you is still in doubt) that those who did not keep their hands from these funds, did not declare war on Christ?

¹⁴⁵ The river concealed 'what offended' by washing it out to sea.

Or did you not hear Christ saying: ‘In as much as you have done it to the least of my brethren, you have done unto me’ (Matthew 25.40)? Well then, those who not only did not do <this>, but stole the funds of the man who had done it and took on the role of foes and enemies against the man who did it, how have they not loosed missiles against the heavens themselves, or rather against their own heads? They ought to have removed the very sicknesses of their brothers with their money, just as Gehazi <removed> the leprosy of Nehemiah (2 Kings 5.20–27). For thus would the fire of Gehenna have become more bearable for them! And yet, when Gehazi lied and asked for a reward for the healing which came from <divine> Grace, he paid the penalty. But these men have robbed the afflicted even of care itself, on which account they themselves would now have suffered this much more justly than Gehazi, if they had suffered it. But since they have for the time being evaded retribution for this, let them await a more intense flame in the hereafter.

66 I will not willingly hide the symbol of the Lord’s anger at what was done. When these men had crossed over to the city with such trophies over piety and were singing songs of victory over the truth, God, who loves mankind and is the saviour of all and the arbiter of what is just, who does not want the death of a sinner so much as that he change his ways and live (Ezekiel 33.11) and because of this always holds his bow drawn for the conversion of such men, knowing that the root of all evil had been concealed in the woman who exercised power, released his hand. The arrow flew and hit the womb of the wretched woman, reminding her and saying: “Woman, in pain will you give birth to children” (Genesis 3.16), sending them forth from your womb straight to the grave, mixing with the first swaddling clothes the final burial shroud and becoming in one instant both a mother and childless.¹⁴⁶

67 And indeed the loss of the child bore fruit. For on the following day, she gave orders to her bodyguard to drive away with whips and abuse those who were hanging about the front doors of the emperor and receiving the woman’s words as if they were some oracle, and, although she had assigned cavalrymen to the persecution of the just man, she brought him back and

¹⁴⁶ Palladius, *Dial.* 9.4–8, speaks more discreetly of ‘a calamity in the imperial bed-chamber’ which occurred within hours of John’s expulsion and persuaded the emperor to recall him. Baur deduced that Palladius’ calamity (θραύσις) must be a miscarriage (1960, 265; cf. Lampe 654; Kelly 1995, 232), but the language that the *Speech* uses, especially its reference to ‘swaddling clothes’, suggests rather a stillbirth. Theodoret, *HE* 5.34.5 claims that it was an earthquake in the night that persuaded Eudoxia to recall John.

requested him to resume possession of his church as quickly as possible.¹⁴⁷

68 But <John> said repeatedly that it was proper for a council of many bishops to take place first¹⁴⁸ and for <his enemies> to be called to justice for their reckless haste, and for him to enter <the city> only after he had been proved not to have deserved what he had suffered. He was convincing in what he said and for many days he remained quiet, staying in a suburb situated at the mouth of the Black Sea and awaiting a just decision from the fathers.¹⁴⁹

69 His adversaries, however, fearful for the future and defending themselves against those who accused them of excessive harshness, protested with oaths that they had not acted in this matter of their own free will, but under compulsion and violence. Their defence amounted to the additional accusation that they had both acted and done nothing according to God, but <only> in order to curry favour with men. As a result, by such a defence, I think, my brothers, they caused a larger number to desire <the presence of> the just man than the whole of the preceding period had.

70 They shamelessly said: ‘What is wrong? Did he himself not also depose others¹⁵⁰ when he crossed into Asia?’¹⁵¹ <Yes,> he did depose <bishops>, but he deposed those who were selling gifts of the Spirit, he did not depose

147 An imperial *notarius* delivered the order for John’s recall (John, *Letter to Innocentius* 105–13; Palladius, *Dial.* 9.5–7). But John had already reached Praenetum, a town situated on the Astacene Gulf between Helenopolis and Nicomedia (*Barrington Atlas*, Map 52 F3), where he was staying before being moved to a more permanent place of exile, before the *cubicularius* Briso, whom Eudoxia had sent in pursuit, escorted John back to Constantinople (Socrates, *HE* 6.16.6; Sozomen, *HE* 8.18.5). We translate one of John’s two letters to Briso (*Letter XI* = 190M).

148 It was a well-established rule that a bishop deposed by a council of bishops could only be legitimately restored to his see by another council of bishops; it was used to justify the depositions of Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra after they returned to their sees on the strength of a recall issued by Constantinus, the son of Constantine, in June 337 (Socrates, *HE* 2.8.6; cf. Palladius, *Dial.* 9.70–72; Barnes 1993, 34, 46).

149 John remained in the suburb of *Marianai* (Sozomen, *HE* 8.18.6; cf. Socrates, *HE* 6.16.7).

150 The word φησί (= ‘he says’) in §70.2 interrupts the alleged quotation from John’s adversaries, and we have followed Ricci in omitting it from our translation. Perhaps it should be emended to the plural φασι.

151 For John’s removal of bishops in Asia, see Palladius, *Dial.* 5.12–53; Socrates, *HE* 6.15.8; Sozomen, *HE* 8.6.1; cf. Kelly 1995, 174–78. On whether he possessed the right to do so, see above, n.62. At the Council of Chalcedon, a priest of the church of Constantinople gave the number of bishops deposed by John as 15 (*ACO* 2.1.3.52 lines 35–38).

them on his own sole authority, he did not depose them by guile, he did not depose them by preventing them from appearing to answer the charges against them,¹⁵² he did not depose them to ingratiate himself with others, he did not depose them with human assistance and using the blade of the sword as an ally to achieve his aim, he did not depose them while he himself stood accused of other charges, he did not depose men who had earlier received written denunciations of him, he deposed them out of love after convincing them that they were being justly deposed. In addition to all this, he deposed them without snuffing them out.¹⁵³

71 If the act of deposing automatically entails deposition for the one who has deposed <another>, you too, Theophilus and the gang around you,¹⁵⁴ should stop pretending to be priests! You earlier deposed vast numbers, all unjustly, and on this occasion you think <that you deposed> this saint. Refusing to say for what reason you did this, you take refuge in the imitation of an action that avoids by a wide margin being the equal of your irrationality. <You act> like a man who, on being accused of treacherously assassinating the finest general, says to his accuser: ‘What is wrong? Did he not kill countless numbers in war and in battle?’ But <his accuser> would justly have said to him: ‘But that man, my dear executioner, <killed> on behalf of his fatherland and defending it against the enemies of the state; what sort of motive do you have to allege other than an impulse to banditry and the bloodthirstiness of your character?’ For your deed has mutilated the churches of the world, while John’s deed – or rather not his deed, for on that occasion the judges and the accusers were others, but nonetheless the action of which he became an unwilling spectator – both brought back into the church those who had previously been scandalized by the corrupt lives of those who had been deposed and added innumerable others to the church through the virtue of those appointed by him.

152 The transmitted text has καὶ καθεῖλεν οὐκ ἐπ’ ἐρημίαις λαβόν but the plural of the Greek noun ἐρημία normally means ‘deserts, desert places’ (hence Ricci’s translation as ‘in luoghi isolati’). We suspect that ἐπ’ ἐρημίαις should be emended to ἐπ’ ἐρήμης (= ‘by default’) and that a contrast is being drawn between the condemnation of bishops in Asia who appeared in person before a council presided over by John and John’s condemnation at the Council of the Oak for his failure to appear in person to answer the charges against him.

153 We have not tried to replicate the wordplay of καθεῖλεν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀνεῖλεν.

154 Conjoined with ὑμεῖς the phrase οἱ περὶ Θεόφιλον must be a genuine plural, as οἱ περὶ + proper name always is in Athanasius, not merely a periphrasis for Theophilus himself, as was normal in late literary Greek (Barnes 1993, 248–49 n.22). It is perhaps, therefore, yet another indicator that the author of the *Funerary Speech* is not a natural practitioner of the high rhetorical style of the Second Sophistic movement (Introduction, section 1.3).

72 They were so blinded by the darkness of evil that they fell into two opposite actions: for on the one hand they said that they had deposed him because he had not been willing to appear when he was summoned by a council, and on the other hand they composed minutes and sent them off to all as though he had come, been judged and convicted of the charges against him.¹⁵⁵ Do you want me to recall their accusations, my friends? For what they composed in an attempt to persuade the people that what they had done had not been done improperly after all will not be very dissimilar from <what> those <say> who honour the saint.

73 I will proceed then. 'He eats alone,' <the accuser> says, 'inviting none of his friends to dine as his dinner companion.' But, my good fellow, this would be an appropriate accusation against a toastmaster, not a bishop.¹⁵⁶

74 'He sold some of the treasures <of the church> and gave away others.'¹⁵⁷ What bishop, pray tell me, does not have the power to manage the treasures of the church? In fact, <what John gave away>, he gave to poor bishops, either for their own sustenance and that of the poor or for the adornment of impoverished churches. The sales which he made were no innovation; but, because those who had long practised the time-honoured custom – which was to gather unneeded objects and to raise money for the large numbers who were maintained out of church funds – said that they themselves had done so, he did not stop the practice in our day. Who does not know that the fathers in the West have a law that they should sell the holy offerings of the church and distribute <the proceeds> to those in need?¹⁵⁸ Nevertheless, the saint did not use this power, but he allowed special offerings and those which were in no way needed in the service <of the church> to be administered for the support of not merely material but spiritual heirlooms.¹⁵⁹ **75** They added to the accusations <the charge> that he took the provisions for maimed brothers supplied to them by the church according to ancient custom, and spent them on his own enjoyment.¹⁶⁰

155 The synodical letter of the Council of the Oak is lost, but Photius preserves a summary of the acts of the council, which we translate in App. A.

156 The twenty-fifth formal charge against John was that 'he was in the habit of eating alone and gluttonously, living like the Cyclopes'.

157 The third and fourth charges brought against John at the Council of the Oak were that 'he sold a number of valuable objects' and that 'the slabs of marble belonging to St Anastasia, that Nectarius had set aside for the decoration of the church, were sold by him'.

158 We cannot find any example of this alleged western practice.

159 That is, human beings. On the possible meanings of *κεμήλιον*, see LSJ 934–35, s.v.

160 Among the charges documented for the Council of the Oak the closest to this are the

Those who said these things, my friends, were those who had found fault with that great expenditure of his for <the lepers> and had laid hold of it, or rather seized it by fraud. And they were listened to and believed by those who had been afraid of <the lepers> as neighbours and who had suspected that the river flowing past would spread the disease in their properties, both on their land and among their people.¹⁶¹ Their minds hated, and their tongues slandered, his great love for beggars, pretending vainly to love their fellow men <by falsely accusing> him of misappropriating funds intended for beggars.

76 About the ‘pastilles’, his changing of vestments and the costly table at the holy Sabbath (Easter Day), which was always kept hidden away and for this reason was an object of suspicion, and on that day revealed only to his enemies, I stay silent and let them expose themselves to derision by speaking of them.¹⁶² For the deposition (God help us!) the vast majority wrote and subscribed borrowing the same scribe’s right hand: so much was their conventicle adorned with wisdom!¹⁶³

77 About that most awful and reckless accusation, which not even the Devil would ever have dared to utter except with a trembling tongue, but which was blathered out by those men, I am compelled to speak. What is this? ‘Once,’ <the accuser> says, ‘he washed in wine which he took and mixed with the communion wine so that those who partook of it would be bound

sixteenth and seventeenth, which claim that John ‘had sold the legacy left by Thecla through the agency of Theodulus and that no-one knew where the income of the church went’.

161 See above, §§ 62–65.

162 The twenty-eighth charge against John at the Council of the Oak was that that ‘he vested and divested himself while chewing a piece of bread on the bishop’s throne’. The author of the *Funerary Speech* presumably took the term *πάστιλλος* from the acts of the council; before 403 the word is attested only in Greek medical and veterinary writers. Palladius, *Dial.* 8.72–75, explained that the unjustified charge arose from the fact that John ‘advised everyone to take a little water or a small particle of food (*ἀπογεύεσθαι ὕδατος ἢ παστίλλου*) after receiving Communion to avoid accidentally spitting out part of the host (*τι τοῦ συμβόλου*) with their saliva or phlegm, and he was the first to do this himself, to teach reverence to those willing to learn’.

163 The orator insinuates that many of the bishops could not write their names in Greek. It is surprising, therefore, that the vast numbers of episcopal subscriptions in the *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* contain only two explicit instances of a subordinate signing on behalf of someone who is described as *ἀρχιδιάκονος* (ACO 1.1.2.63 line 24 [an archdeacon on behalf of Theodorus, the bishop of Gadara, at the Council of Ephesus in 431]; 3.49 line 38 [a petition submitted by the head of the Monastery of Thomas in Constantinople to the patriarch Menas in 536]).

and rendered obedient to him by a spell.’ This they did not dare to put in writing through fear of death from the laws in place against those who try to do or merely to say these things.¹⁶⁴ But they did not cease bombarding the hearing of those with itchy ears who followed their every breath and word (2 Timothy 4.3). Do all of you brothers who have not been initiated into the mysteries still love the saint? Disprove the blasphemy and say when and what you drank in his presence to confirm an oath that you were being initiated into mysteries by him or by priests in communion with him on pain of dying in sin.¹⁶⁵ And you among the clergy who at that time were in communion with him, men like Atticus, Helpidius and their ilk,¹⁶⁶ please <state>¹⁶⁷ the reasons why you hate the saint. Stop up one another’s mouths that spew out lies or else explain what sort of antidote you took to counteract such great trickery. But how simpleminded <of me>! For they deserve to be driven out and excommunicated merely for saying such things. They pride themselves on mixing the trickery of demons with the blood of Christ in the ears of men.

THE RETURN OF JOHN TO CONSTANTINOPLE

Enough of this madness! **78** Let us stick to the sequence of our narrative, resuming it from where we left it a little while ago.¹⁶⁸ We left the saint in a suburb, sitting peacefully waiting for the judgment of the fathers. When some had already arrived, though others had not, those who had come all gave the verdict that the bishop who had been ejected so cruelly and unreasonably ought to enter and possess his church, whereas those who had something against him should be exposed to refutation, while <those who had not arrived> gave as an excuse the length of the journey, the press of business or the frailty of the body, but all ratified the <decision> by letter and, though absent, signified their agreement with those who were present, being persuaded by the conduct of the case.

164 This extraordinary charge is not found in any other source – which seems to confirm that it was not written down.

165 This we take to be the effective meaning of the words ‘or, if not this, that you will depart to the Lord in this state’.

166 On Atticus and Helpidius, see below, §§ 106, 134.

167 We have supplied the infinitive εἰπεῖν from the imperative εἰπατε in the preceding sentence.

168 At the end of § 68.

79 With matters standing thus and with <John's> congregation¹⁶⁹ incensed when they discovered precisely the source of the violence (for <John's enemies> could no longer conceal the facts, being ashamed and having nothing to say), and with a great civil disturbance being planned in secret – for already another <disturbance> had taken place, when <John's enemies> took over the church as if it were some cave, filled the entire sanctuary with stones and clubs and either unjustly compelled all those who entered to pray to anathematize the bishop or sent them away after they had received many wounds, so that the place of holy baptism was filled with the blood of children and witnessed lying wounded next to it those whom it had once received, transformed and given birth to in the word of the Lord,¹⁷⁰— when shouted denunciations clearly identified those responsible and the shouts reached the ears of the emperor, the saint was invited to enter <the city> by letters from those who were making war on him which offered him sworn promises that they would not fail to convene a council in order to examine the facts accurately.

80 How the city, when it learnt of the matter, all ran together and what they shouted, I cannot narrate with this single weak tongue of mine. But I myself, my friends, was present and watched¹⁷¹ as all, spurred by the goad of their longing, almost made a bold attack against the waves of the sea themselves. When they had welcomed the saint, they composed hymns of victory and they marched along, some quoting from the works of the blessed David,¹⁷² others from the words of the great Moses after he had just crossed the Red Sea on foot (Exodus 15.1–18), others from the ode of Zachariah when he announced peace to Israel (Luke 1.67–79), and others again the song of the angels: 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill among men' (Luke 2.14).¹⁷³

169 We take τοῦ λαοῦ to mean 'the laity', as it so often does (Lampe 792–93, s.v. 5), rather than the populace of Constantinople as a whole.

170 John himself describes this episode in his *Letter to Innocentius* (lines 105–85), where he states that imperial troops were ordered to quell the violence. Zosimus identifies those who invaded John's church as monks (5.23.4–5), while Socrates reports a battle between 'Constantinopolitans' and 'Alexandrians' in which people were wounded and killed during John's first exile (*HE* 6.17.4–6). For discussion, see Gregory 1973; Ommeslaeghe 1981, 333–39; Kelly 1995, 233–35.

171 For what is known about the author of the *Speech*, see Introduction, sections 3, 4.

172 Sc. from the Psalms.

173 Like so many patristic writers, the *Funerary Speech* quotes this form of Luke 2.14 rather than the alternative wording ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας ('among men of goodwill') so familiar in the Latin version of the Gloria (*hominibus bonae voluntatis*).

No-one's right hand was not holding a torch. The well-off were not content with providing an abundance of lamps, but those who were in the habit of using slaves to light their way during the evening and at night, themselves on that occasion gladly took over the torch-bearing task of their servants. The whole city then had the appearance of a great rose garden, covering the ground beneath with leaves and branches, but displaying on its surface the stately and most desirable colour of roses. Because of their great number, the feet and bodies of men hid the ground, while they displayed in their hands flames that flew aloft resembling flowers, some <torches> being nourished by papyrus wicks and oil, others by wax.¹⁷⁴

81 That day then also reminded the Jewish people of their crossing through the waters. They called the saint Moses and <his> Egyptian <enemy> Pharaoh because of his very close <similarity> in place and character (Genesis 12.10–20).¹⁷⁵ <John> repaid their good will with the highest honour: riding on a foal (cf. Matthew 21.2–7; John 12.15), he made the sign of the cross above their heads with his finger, and all that was missing was for him to say: 'My greatest honour is that this (sc. the cross) is being venerated' and: 'I am a servant of the one who was crucified then by your ancestors' (cf. Matthew 27.25).

82 The great similarity of the case also led them¹⁷⁶ to the following considerations. For the mainland received the saint after he had crossed the narrow

174 A bathetic conclusion to a striking passage. The orator unduly emphasizes that the rich as well as the poor carried their own torches. This detail is not made explicit by the narrative sources such as Theodoret: 'When the faithful people learned what was going on they covered the mouth of the Propontis with their boats, and the whole population lighted up waxen torches and came forth to meet him' (HE 5.34.6; cf. Socrates, HE 6.16.8; Sozomen, HE 8.18.7). John himself claims that he re-entered Constantinople accompanied by a *notarius* and 30 bishops (Letter to Innocentius 110–13).

The *Funerary Speech* glosses over something of vital importance in its account of John's return, viz., his ultimately fatal acquiescence in the emperor's request that he resume his episcopal throne and give the greeting 'Peace be with you' at the opening of the liturgy (Socrates, HE 6.16.10–12; Sozomen, HE 8.18.7) without waiting for a council of bishops to rehabilitate him formally, as John himself knew to be required by canon law (§ 68).

175 In the spurious second *Sermo post reditum* (CPG 4399; cf. Introduction, section 7.1), John is presented as comparing Theophilus, not to the Rameses of Exodus, but to the earlier Pharaoh who was smitten with Sarah, the wife of Abraham, took her into his harem and later suffered plagues sent by God for his action (PG 52.443; cf. Genesis 12.14–20).

176 In our view this is another piece of careless writing: the pronoun αὐτοῖς ought grammatically to refer to the Jews of Constantinople in the preceding chapter, but it must in logic have a wider reference.

strait and escorted him to the church, just as it received Moses of old so that he could converse with the Lord on the mountain (Exodus 19), but it handed <his enemy> over to the great neighbouring sea (Exodus 14.21–31). For when he heard these things, the great Theophilus tossed aside the <biblical> account of the adulterer applicable to himself (Genesis 12.14–20), which he was making <the basis of his actions>, chose flight instead, leapt on to a ferry, and fled with no-one in pursuit. And because the sailors were lamenting the lack of wind, he said that their oars should replace the wind.

The man who had shaken the whole earth with his plot sought safety in pitiful flight! He was inundated with despondency and sea water, while the saint was <inundated> with the waves of the multitude of his children. And just as when the sun appears, the despondency of darkness is dissolved, the wild beasts of the forest flee and return to their lairs, so too then when this just man appeared all despair flew out of every soul, while all the conventicles of the wicked were disbanded and each of them ran away to his own cave.¹⁷⁷

NEW PERSECUTIONS AND JOHN'S FINAL DEPOSITION

83 The Devil was troubled by the unexpected outcome of the case, because the shoot did not seem to him to be like the seed. For he had sowed loss of reputation and loss of honour against one who had for a very long time been fighting him intensely, but he now observed both his honour and fame growing and his reputation increasing beyond all calculation. As he saw the just man being crowned because of the very machinations he had set in motion against him, he was reduced to perplexity and once again, as it is reasonable to conjecture, with a shameless face began to find fault with the Lord's help, saying: 'Does this man John, to whom you have decreed such great glory, giving you piety as payment for his success, worship you again without paying for the privilege (Job 1.9)? Or do you not think that he avails himself of complete freedom of expression and wages war on me, because he has become emboldened by means of your help and with this expects to be unassailable and completely invincible? Please now at least give me the authority to prove that he is playing the good Christian in vain.'¹⁷⁸ I think

¹⁷⁷ Theophilus was accompanied on his hasty voyage to Alexandria by Severianus of Gabala, the monk Isaac and others who had led the opposition against John (John, *Letter to Innocentius* 115–19; Palladius, *Dial.* 9.8–9; Socrates, *HE* 6.17.6; Sozomen, *HE* 8.19.3).

¹⁷⁸ The verb φιλοσοφῆω, which literally means 'to philosophize', often designates living a virtuous Christian life (Lampe 1481, s.v. B). We assume that the Devil uses the word sarcastically.

that the all-wise God who wished to extinguish the infamy arising from the pretended deposition and to bring about his return through <John's> own will and efforts, saw to it he enjoyed firm and unshaken communion with all bishops apart from those who had perpetrated the illegality, whom he had completely expelled from communion as unworthy. Once again he opened the stadium for competitions, and gave that authority to the one who was attacking the church <by attacking> <John's> life.¹⁷⁹ Having acquired this authority, what did he do?

84 When all the others had fled, the Devil persuaded the old man who was his constant companion, whom he had trained in every form of wickedness over the course of many years, not to fear death, since he was in any event close to the gates of death (Psalm 106[107].18), but to choose death with renown over living in dishonour after being defeated by a man unskilled in wickedness: for both the Devil and the old man regarded victory over the truth as genuine glory.¹⁸⁰ He opened the women's quarters as a place of refuge for him and as a meeting-place for those wild animals among the clergy who were skulking in the houses of women whom he knew to have been in conflict with the just man for a long time, since <John> criticized them for continuing to beautify themselves when they were old, tried to reform them and was more intolerable to them than Gehenna itself by making speeches about Gehenna echo constantly in their ears.¹⁸¹

Leaving this man on the spot to do whatever he wanted (he wanted after all to sow malicious denigration of the saint in the ears of all), the Devil himself scurried to Galatia to rouse to action a fellow who was easily swayed in his opinions, who was a wild beast in both name and character, and who by his very nature was everything for which Paul denounced the Galatians (Galatians 1.6–9, 3.1–3).¹⁸² He implanted in the woman who wielded power forgetfulness of the earlier blow and introduced in its stead a profound

179 Despite his triumphant return, John had still not been reinstated by a council, despite making repeated requests to the emperor to convene one for this purpose (*Letter to Innocentius* 114–15).

180 Three manuscripts identify the 'old man' as Acacius of Beroea. John himself later complained that 'certain Syrians' hostile to him remained in Constantinople after the departure of Theophilus (*Letter to Innocentius* 138–40).

181 For John's criticism of older women for beautifying themselves, see Palladius, *Dial.* 8.79–85 (above n.97).

182 Two manuscripts identify the Galatian as Leontius of Ancyra. The *Funerary Speech* gives Leontius a much more prominent role than does Palladius, who names him together with Ammonius, bishop of Laodicea Combusta/Katakekaumene, as a supporter of Theophilus' charge that John had regained his see illegally (*Dial.* 9.53–55).

hatred, which he contrived with no great toil, spreading many lies through many mouths.¹⁸³

85 The old man, remaining there¹⁸⁴ as if he were in a cave, said many things against our father to those who entered, but he failed to prove even a few of them. He resembled an archer who has confidence in the speed of his horse to save him, but releases arrows against the enemy as he flees choosing to waste his arrows or considering their loss trivial. And just as a hoplite who had measured out a stade would not have persuaded the archer to join battle when he called him, so too his heart did not greatly persuade this man, who had released verbal arrows, either to harm him or to miss, but cowardice convinced him that benefit lay in the act of persuading and, when he was called upon to prove what he was saying, to seek refuge in blaming those who had ordered him to do these things.

86 After a lapse of time, when all the holy fathers were gathered together, some physically in person, others in spirit by means of letters alone, and all proclaimed invalid the absurdity that had taken place earlier and very nobly confirmed the bishop's entitlement to hold his earlier rank (the bishops who actually came approached sixty in number, while those who expressed their agreement with the verdict by letter numbered almost five times as many – and not long after as many as ten times more western bishops),¹⁸⁵ the Galatian came alone as if he surpassed so many bishops of such quality in intelligence and piety and had been thoroughly trained in the understanding of ecclesiastical law. When on his arrival he was discovered to hold against our father views that were contrary to the holy fathers, he was reckoned in the eyes of those in power as the saviour of all and the collective benefactor of the priesthood and the empire. The second council comprised this man alone. If anyone came later and learned what was being decided by those

183 The 'earlier blow' refers to the stillbirth in 403 (above, § 66).

184 Sc., in Constantinople.

185 Sozomen, *HE* 8.19.8, also states that 60 bishops met in Constantinople and annulled the decisions of the Council of the Oak, while Socrates gives the number as 65 (*HE* 6.18.9). The names of the 300 additional eastern bishops were presumably added later, as previously had been the case when more than 200 names of bishops were subsequently added to the synodical letter of the western bishops at the Council of Serdica in 343, which restored Athanasius to the see of Alexandria (Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos* 49.1–50.3 [127.4–132.3 Opitz]). The 600 western bishops must represent the author's estimate of the number whose support he inferred from that of Innocentius, the bishop of Rome; John never mentions any such council in his letter to Innocent, presumably because, while the latter knew about it, its legal status was dubious since it had not been summoned by either emperor (cf. Kelly 1995, 238).

inside, he was induced to desert to the views of those men by hope of honour among men and unjust gain. Indeed they persuaded even those inside to have no shame any longer, to accomplish what pleased them by using violence rather than proper procedure.¹⁸⁶

87 When Lent was approaching, they summoned the saint to the emperor's audience halls and attempted to persuade him to give up his church voluntarily and to retire, surrendering care of it to people who had no connection with it.¹⁸⁷ When he said that this was not possible, that it would impose a great sin upon him and that he would prefer to lose his own head rather than give up vigils and prayer for his church, the woman¹⁸⁸ cast aside the sense of shame that confers elegance on women and, as if she intended to hold the reins of the imperial power from then on, said: 'I will bring this sin upon my own head,' becoming an unwilling prophet against herself. The saint, smiling in silence, said: 'But I do not think, woman, that you will be a sufficient guarantor for me for the remission of so great a sin. For it did not benefit Adam at all to say "Eve deceived me" (cf. Genesis 3.12) nor did her attempt to take refuge in the deception of the serpent benefit Eve herself, but both of them gave individual recompense to God for their sin.' But she, turning her back on him with angry shouts while he was still speaking, claimed that in his speech he equated her with Eve (as if she was any better than Eve even in any small way) and the emperor with Adam, and she began to say repeatedly: 'What more need do we have of witnesses against the man? (Matthew 26.65) He has cursed¹⁸⁹ the emperor, let him depart into exile as quickly as possible.'¹⁹⁰

88 Then, as if the imperial purple also conferred on them the authority of the vaults of heaven over the priesthood, though it did not belong to them

186 The facts behind this extremely allusive sentence are that John's enemies summoned bishops from Syria, Cappadocia, Phrygia and Pontus to the council in Constantinople which the *Funerary Speech* presents as a council comprising Leontius alone and that for some weeks (Palladius claims that it was nine or ten months) from late 403 a group of bishops hostile to John confronted John and a group of 42 bishops loyal to him (*Dial.* 9.33–114).

187 Antiochus, the bishop of Ptolemais (§ 45), and those opposed to John approached the emperor with a request that he expel John (Palladius, *Dial.* 9.115–19).

188 I.e., the empress Eudoxia.

189 Although εὐλογέω etymologically means 'bless', it is here a euphemism for 'curse' (Lampe 568, s.v. II C).

190 It was of course Arcadius who issued the order to expel John from Constantinople (Palladius, *Dial.* 9.126–38). On John's relationship with Eudoxia, see Introduction, sections 8.2–3.

at all, they arrested the saint and expelled him from his holy duties.¹⁹¹ They handed over the church to the one who had come from Galatia and to a certain Pisidian with him,¹⁹² using armed soldiers, who even themselves lamented the outrageous nature of their action. Suspecting the impulses of the crowd, in case they might at some time abandon the church because of the injustice against their shepherd and create a grievous schism (which in fact happened) and wanting divisions not to arise even though they were doing exactly what creates divisions, they appeared to contrive something, but did nothing useful and accomplished nothing.

89 At the beginning of Lent¹⁹³ they spread word throughout the city that the emperor thought after all that he ought to entrust the divine liturgy to those in the middle, who were in communion with neither party, until the verdict which was constantly expected but which would never be delivered. (They called the city mobs which had long inclined to side with them ‘those in the middle’.) They acted as follows: for the present they dragged <John’s> congregation into communion with those who had not to be sure wronged the man, but who would later appeal to their illegal action in earlier matters, in the expectation that all those who had entered into communion <with them> by compulsion would remain in communion once it existed. Those who were prudent and sensible recognized the bait at the beginning and refused to take part in the sacrifice being performed contrary to the law – if indeed one ought to call such a thing a sacrifice. But those to whom this act seemed at the time to be reasonable, subsequently realized that they had made a bad decision, withdrew and asked to do penance for their unwitting transgression.¹⁹⁴

90 Those men were then in the depths, performing a <secular> service for powerful people rather than <divine> service for Christ and by such

191 John was first simply confined to his residence (John, *Letter to Innocentius* 145; Palladius, *Dial.* 9.132–38; Socrates, *HE* 6.18.12; Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.1). Palladius’ surmise that this was done so that John could quickly be restored in case divine wrath over his unjust removal became manifest implies that the authorities were testing public reaction to his removal.

192 The pair are Leontius of Ancyra and Ammonius of Laodicea Combusta (above, n.182).

193 Since Easter Sunday fell on 17 April in 404, the date indicated is early March.

194 This group of bishops ‘in the middle’ is not mentioned in any other source. On the other hand, the *Funerary Speech* omits an episode described in Palladius, *Dial.* 9.139–47, who reports that John remained in the episcopal residence in Constantinople, where he was confined, until ‘the Great Sabbath’, that is, the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter Sunday, when he was asked to leave, but refused. Arcadius then summoned Acacius and Antiochus and asked them how he should proceed in this delicate situation; they replied ‘Let the deposition of John be on our heads’ (cf. Matthew 27.25).

devotions worshipping the enemy of the church rather than its Saviour.¹⁹⁵ But the saint, sitting on high, was full of the wisdom which Abraham demonstrated when he twice calmly tolerated the adultery of his wife (Genesis 12.10–20; 20). But the patriarch of old (may he allow me to speak the truth) did not <merely> endure the act, but planned it in fear of death. This man, however, who now dwells in his bosom (cf. Luke 16.22–23), would gladly have endured countless deaths to avoid this happening, but because he could not prevent it he was protected by his wise tranquillity.

91 The congregation began running around the other churches, where they found the remnants of the disciples of our father. <Leontius and Ammonius>¹⁹⁶ allowed them to keep the remaining churches by treachery. I will describe the treachery. For when the whole of Lent had passed in this way and the night was approaching, which is always longed for but which was on that occasion painful to all, knowing that it is customary for the multitude, even if they have cut themselves off from communion for the whole year because they have frequently engaged in business, oaths and words of abuse, and in both marital and extramarital sexual activities (some chaste, others not), to approach <the altar> and to receive the gift <of communion> as if they have been purified from all such <sinful> acts by the fast and prayer, after raising the expectation of all until the very evening,¹⁹⁷ they ordered the enemies <of John> to seize the churches in the depths of night, so that they might deprive those entering of seeing <clearly>, since some could not see who was officiating in the service because of the untimely hour and hence naively thought that they were those who had possessed the churches until then, while others could see, but were impelled to take communion as normal because it was the feast <of Easter> and they could not obtain communion anywhere else.¹⁹⁸ But they had deceived themselves by planning irrational acts against rational men: for they were so far away

195 Palladius, *Dial.* 9.127–32, makes the same play on the word λειτουργία in its senses of ‘task performed in fulfillment of an obligation to a city or the state’ and ‘divine worship’ (Lampe 795).

196 The third person plural verb ‘allowed’ (εἵσαν) lacks a stated subject: we have supplied one from §§88–90.

197 When used metaphorically, as here, the Greek verb μετεωρίζω (‘raise in the air’) normally carries the connotation of raising false hopes (LSJ 1120, s.v. II).

198 On the night of the Easter vigil of 404 (16–17 April), 40 bishops loyal to John accosted Arcadius and Eudoxia to plead for him as they visited the shrine of the martyrs, and Paul of Crateia is said to have appealed directly to Eudoxia with the bold words, ‘Eudoxia, fear God, have pity on your children, do not outrage the feast of Christ by the shedding of blood’ (Palladius, *Dial.* 9.148–61; cf. Ommeslaeghe 1992).

from being able to deceive the people that they needed soldiers armed with swords to take possession even of the walls of the churches.¹⁹⁹

92 That night then began to resemble the evening of the Crucifixion,²⁰⁰ when of his own volition the Lord already lay bound in the grave after being crucified (cf. John 19.40), while his disciples were driven away and in the grip of a triple despair – despair at what had happened to their teacher, despair created by fear of their persecutors, and a third despair, which they were not able to bear, as they saw the scribes and Pharisees clapping their hands with glee as over a victory. Among the disciples of this blessed man were all the following <reactions>: they lamented the injustice against him, they were distressed at being thrust out from the churches themselves by force,²⁰¹ and they gnashed their teeth as they watched the enemies of the cross exulting and uttering words that far surpassed the snorting of the Devil.

93 There was also something more to cause them despair, which not even a soul of stone would ever be able to narrate without weeping. What is this? When some of those who had come to the holy rites of initiation had just emerged from the pool of the baptismal font, others were still in it, and others were ready to immerse themselves, a solid mass of soldiers entered with swords and clubs. <Leontius and Ammonius> had chosen soldiers ignorant of the mysteries,²⁰² so that they might not spare those being baptized²⁰³ out of reverence for the rite being performed; they beat and drove out those who lacked both clothing and sin (because of which we humans needed clothes), sparing no-one, not even womenfolk, whom nature has taught especially to feel shame at being naked (Genesis 3.7–11); those who were clothed and were seeking the food of salvation, which up to that time they had experienced only by hearsay, and were tearfully longing for spiritual nourishment (cf. 1 Peter 2.2),²⁰⁴ they cast headlong and threw out. In these it was possible to see the infants of Israel in Egypt, who were attacked before they could speak (Exodus 1.16–22); for they were expelled from life before

199 The passage implies that, while they could seize the church buildings, they could not win over those who worshipped in the churches.

200 Literally, ‘of the Cross’.

201 Soldiers entered the church to remove the followers of John in the evening (John, *Letter to Innocentius* 148–51; Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.1).

202 The soldiers were commanded by the pagan Lucius (Palladius, *Dial.* 9.178–81, 10.40–45). Lucius presumably held the rank of tribune, while his troops were a *schola* of the imperial bodyguard (*PLRE* 2.691, Lucius 1).

203 For νήπιος in this sense, see Lampe 908, s.v. B 1.

204 Literally, ‘the spiritual nipple’; for the metaphorical sense of θηλή, see Lampe 650.

they crossed the frontiers of nature or began to live, whereas these people, who had not yet beheld the Sun of righteousness (Malachi 3.20) in a state of purity, were pushed away from their mother together with their nurses (I mean the priests).²⁰⁵

94 I admire these people for their faith <more> than all those of old – both those who had put their trust in God by the just prompting of the soul and those who were later convinced in the right spirit by seeing signs – because, having heard great things about the mysteries, <that is> the eating and drinking of the Lord's body and blood and the descent of the Holy Spirit, and all the other things in which we ourselves have faith and in which we endeavour to persuade those without faith to believe, and having seen the rite, so awesome and fearful to demons, trampled by men unable to reason, received no injury to their souls from the scandal, but rather, when the body, which the Cherubim cannot approach, was scattered on the ground by profane hands and the Lord's blood was again poured out, they rushed to <embrace> the forbearance of the Lord, taking cognizance of the fact that it was no great matter <for God> to allow this to happen when he had seen that first holy body nailed to the cross without resorting to anger even then.

95 They spent that night in these persecutions. When day broke, the congregation, full of blood and wounds, came together with the newly baptized, saw those who had committed adultery with their mother <the church> milling around, and created the schism in the church which <Leontius and Ammonius> had long feared (if indeed one ought to call it a schism at all). For abandoning only the walls and the men who were more irrational than the walls and the perpetrators of the illegality, they ran to the building of the founder of the city. There they assembled the spiritual building of our father (1 Corinthians 3.9; 1 Peter 2.5) which was under attack. And a work of pious men came into existence, one that that contained another work, a work made of stone <containing> a work composed of grace and faith, a work which <Constantine> had wrought for the care of bodies, but which had become one for the healing of souls.²⁰⁶

205 The sources disagree over where this violent episode took place: it is located in the Great Church by John himself (*Letter to Innocentius* 149–59), the *Funerary Speech* and Sozomen (*HE* 8.21.2), in the Baths of Constantine by Palladius (*Dial.* 9.162–66), who seems to conflate the events of Holy Saturday with those of the following day, when clerics loyal to John met in the Baths of Constantine to celebrate Easter (below § 95). Socrates says nothing about violence on either day (*HE* 6.18.14; cf. Kelly 1995, 244–45).

206 The so-called Baths of Constantine (Socrates, *HE* 6.18.14; Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.3) were

96 There once again they rushed to persecution and again began to violate the mysteries, far exceeding the sacrilege of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 5.1–4). For he had only used as if they were profane the sacred vessels which the priests employed at that time in matters greatly inferior to the present ones, whereas these men undertook war on the holy things themselves and against the body and blood of Christ.

97 Then, on the day after that, the congregation ran to the hippodrome,²⁰⁷ not at all ashamed at leaving the <city> walls undefended in their flight from sin and saying that it was those with golden roofs and walls <on their houses> who were acting illegally and who ought to be ashamed instead. They so filled up the whole of that flat space, that one might have said, upon seeing their multitude, that not only those who used to gather together in the churches were there, but that double their number had been added to them having appeared from somewhere. Before he built the city, the blessed Constantine had once made that place a hippodrome,²⁰⁸ so that it appears to me that it is due to this man²⁰⁹ that all <Constantine's> works became churches – the colonnades, the marketplace, the city, the baths, the hippodrome, all of which had been filled with prayers while the holy father was present, but reverted to their former status after he had departed, including the church itself, which has taken the name and function of a public square.²¹⁰ To those who gathered there the Word, the Lord of the word, opened the mouths of children to give instruction, children who were disciples of the saint, and it was possible to see at that time the illegal actions of elderley priests²¹¹ being exposed as such by their juniors.

in fact constructed under Constantine's son Contantius between 345 and 347 (Janin 1964, 372–73). Palladius, *Dial.* 9.162–77, puts the move to the Baths of Constantine a day earlier and makes the embarrassing abandonment of the churches on the Easter Vigil the main reason why Lucius was sent in with armed soldiers (§§ 92–93).

207 This was the occasion when John's followers began to call themselves Johannites according to Socrates, *HE* 6.18.14–15; Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.4. The hippodrome to which the *Funerary Speech* alludes lay outside the city near the so-called Pempton gate (see Janin 1964, 219–20, 280–81, 372–73, 452). Palladius, *Dial.* 9.218–29, reports that there were about 3,000 neophytes there when the emperor Arcadius rode out to inspect the area. Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 201 n.3, implicitly suggest that the number comes from Acts 2.41.

208 Barnes 2011, 113, argues that it was Licinius who built the hippodrome of Byzantium which Constantine demolished.

209 That is, John.

210 Or 'market' (ἀγοράς), cf. LSJ, s.v.

211 We take πρεσβυτέρων as doing double duty in characterizing both the age and the status of John's episcopal enemies.

98 Such absurdities still did not satisfy <John's enemies>, but they expected to live the whole of their lives in peril and in great discomfort unless they expelled the saint from both the city and life itself. What therefore did they do? Having thoroughly investigated every form of slander and wickedness and having discovered that all <their efforts> were being overcome by the truth, they sought refuge in the illegal laws of the Arians and with them plotted evil concerning the saint, copying <the Arians'> madness concerning the blessed Athanasius.

99 That affair occurred like this.²¹² Once upon a time, when Constantius had acquired the sceptre of rule over the Romans and as a result of the simplicity of his own character and the evil disposition of those around him had become madly enthusiastic about the Arian form of worship, those who bore the name of bishop among them assembled and persuaded the emperor that while Athanasius was alive the whole of Egypt would never be able to share in their error. They said that should it be necessary to kill the fellow in order to capture the masses, they would neither fail nor be at a loss for pretexts on which they would drag him to his death. They summoned the blessed man to them by imperial letters, and having themselves convened a council for this purpose, although they were in all only thirty in number, they strung together a swarm of slanders against him and produced a hand, saying that this was <the hand> of a man who, when he was still alive and had both hands, had been killed and (God help us!) mutilated by the blessed man.²¹³ But when the dead man appeared and with a loud voice ushered the slander out,²¹⁴ they were put to shame, though they did not cease from their wickedness. But being worsted in everything by the man's freedom of speech and by the true course of events, they finally deposed

212 For Athanasius' condemnation by councils of bishops meeting in Tyre (335) and Antioch (338, 339 and 349), see Barnes 1993, 22–25, 35–46, 94–100. The account in the *Funerary Speech* is very confused and muddles a story about the 330s with events of the 350s. The council which condemned Athanasius but numbered only 30 bishops is the Council of Milan which Constantius summoned in 355 (Barnes 1993, 117, 275–76 n.47), while the charge that Athanasius had had Arsenius murdered was to have been examined at the proposed Council of Caesarea in 334, which Constantine cancelled when Arsenius was found alive (Barnes 1993, 21–22, 25, 28, 37–38).

213 Arsenius, bishop of Hypsele; the story that Athanasius produced him alive and with both hands at the Council of Tyre (Rufinus, *HE* 10.18, pp. 983–85 Mommsen; Theodoret, *HE* 1.30; Sozomen, *HE* 2.25.7–12) was invented in the late fourth century.

214 The Greek verb ἐκπομπεύειν is a favourite of John, who uses it 148 times out of a total of 220 occurrences in the whole of Greek literature; here it does not have its familiar funerary connotations (as it does in § 1).

him on the grounds that he was a father of heresy and falsified the teaching of the apostles.²¹⁵ However, suspecting a change in the political situation, they added to the deposition <of Athanasius> a law which laid down that it was in no way whatever permissible for a deposed person to have his case adjudicated a second time.²¹⁶

100 But the case of the blessed Athanasius requires many other long explanations – of how he hastened to Rome which was undefiled and had never received those who had committed adultery against the church nor the bastard texts of their teaching, but preserves the bodies, the doctrines and the faith of the pillars of the church (Galatians 2.9), I mean Peter and Paul, of how he was received into communion with the fathers, and of how all the fathers anathematized that illegal law, those who had laid it down and those who might use it on a later occasion.²¹⁷

However, so that we do not lose the thread of the present exposition, let us keep to the chronological sequence of our speech, since it is by this that we are compelled to bring the memory of these events before you.

101 Those fine fellows took this law, my friends, as a canon of the church and persuaded the emperor, who was willing, that it was not after all possible for the man to have his case adjudicated a second time after his deposition.²¹⁸ Since some of those men had changed to our worship when the orthodox faith prevailed because of the piety and the authority of another emperor,²¹⁹ in order continuously to enjoy the wealth of the church, having a

215 This is totally false.

216 The allusion is to the fourth canon of a Council of Antioch which was included in the earliest collections of canon law and which laid down that 'if a bishop deposed by a council ... attempts to perform any liturgy, ... it should no longer be possible for him to have a hope of being restored or the opportunity of defending himself, not even at another council' (Joannou 1962b, 107–08). The canons, which early acquired authoritative status (*CPG* 8536), were generally believed to have been enacted by the so-called 'Dedication Council' of 341 (as by Palladius, *Dial.* 9.70–72); in fact, they come from an earlier Council of Antioch probably held in 327 or 328 (Barnes 1993, 46, 252 n.45).

217 For the known facts about Athanasius' flight to Rome in 339, his reception there and the councils held in Antioch and Rome in 341, which the *Speech* misrepresents, see Barnes 1993, 47–62.

218 Theophilus had sent a text of the canons of the Council of Antioch to Constantinople to be used against John (Palladius, *Dial.* 9.60–63); there was a large dossier of documents relating to Athanasius in Alexandria, of which a copy was sent to Carthage in 418, from which derive the parts of the dossier preserved in Latin translation in Verona (see, very briefly, Barnes 1993, 4).

219 This must be an allusion to Theodosius and the reaffirmation of the Nicene creed at the Council of Constantinople in 381 (as Ricci sees).

single object of worship, the care of the stomach, they named them ‘fathers’ because of this – and they were right to call ‘fathers’ those of whose inheritance of illegality they had taken possession.²²⁰ When they had with difficulty found a pretext for removing the just man that had an appearance of proper procedure, they did not at all call him to trial (for they feared his tongue even in those things they considered just), but the holy bishops who were in communion with him.

102 Declaring their plan in the presence of the emperor himself and the great council²²¹ and showing the ordinances of the true fathers, in which (as I have just said)²²² <the fathers> anathematized both <their enemies> and those who might use those letters either on that occasion or subsequently, with the result that, as if they had been summoned into court with defeat staring them in the face, but had prevailed contrary to the expectation and plan of <their enemies>,²²³ they were being ejected from the imperial quarters, receiving words of abuse as their payment for victory.²²⁴ Who <ever> saw, who <ever> heard of such abundance in victory? The enemy were numerous, the judges were hostile and the <rewards> of victory were expanded by the silence of the just man.

103 But as they went out the <enemies of John>, who had been defeated, said to the ruler <of all>, the Lord: ‘Is he innocent in your eyes, emperor?’²²⁵ He is not innocent. Have pity on us, cast the fellow out.’ Anyone could justly have said to them as they said this: ‘Scroungers for injustice, you ask for mercy without mercy, you seek pity while destroying pity, you invoke Christ while plotting against Christ. With what sort of soul do you think these things? With what sort of tongue do you speak?’

220 The allusion is to the enemies of Athanasius (Ricci).

221 The Senate of Constantinople (cf. § 14).

222 In § 101; the speaker appeals again to the canons associated with the Council of Antioch in 341.

223 That is, Acacius and Antiochus (§§ 45, 108).

224 The *Funerary Speech* alludes to, but passes rapidly over, an episode which in fact took place several months before Easter 404 and is described in Palladius, *Dial.* 9.73–108; cf. Socrates, *HE* 6.18.11; Sozomen, *HE* 8.20.5. The opponents of John, including Ammonius, Leontius, Acacius, Antiochus and Severianus, proposed to the emperor that ten bishops from among John’s supporters should come to verify that the canons applied to him, but, led by Helpidius, the bishop of Laodicea, and a certain Tranquillus, these bishops argued that the canons promoted by John’s opponents were Arian and that John had returned to Constantinople at the behest of the emperor.

225 For βασιλεύς (‘king’) applied to Christ, see Lampe 292, s.v. II B a.

104 Theophilus, having learnt of these things rather late, praised himself for his cowardice, because, having been summoned later (and summoned not to give an account of his unjust deeds, but to confirm what had been done), he was unwilling to endure coming to a second reversal after he had tasted the earlier complete one.

105 As if celebrating a great triumph, the congregation led the holy fathers with much thanksgiving to the saint, but after their defeat their character led his adversaries to a greater act of daring. They discussed a quick and certain way of ridding themselves of the man – by assassination. Having found a fellow in whom some demon had made his dwelling place, they bought his wretched right hand, thinking that the demon too would certainly collaborate with him as if for killing an enemy. But when he came to this <act>, he was quickly exposed by his troubled look and demeanour as putting the drama on stage before the deed: he was dragged by the congregation to the prefect still holding the dagger in his hands, and the prefect would have discovered the whole plot then and there by using the appropriate tortures, if the father had not sent bishops and snatched that man who was mad with an illness both physical and mental from the hands of the executioners, out of respect for whom the congregation continued to remain peaceful.²²⁶

106 Blaming the demon for the delay, <John's enemies> approached a second assassin, who was in no way possessed by a demon, but who surpassed the whole tribe of demons in boldness and daring. This man was a servant of one of the priests, who boasted greatly of his old age, displayed his grey hair as demanding honour and who had nourished his own heart with such counsels.²²⁷ When this man came and with much boldness attempted to run towards the saint with a disorderly rush and vehemently, he was checked by one of those who knew that he was a servant of that priest and wanted to learn the reason for his haste. But the assassin struck the man with a Lemnian hand.²²⁸ having received words of friendship, he gave a blow in return. This man had only just fallen when the man behind him, who had seen what happened, cried out and was laid low, and a third on top

226 Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.5, also reports this attempt to murder John by a possessed man.

227 The priest is named as Helpidius (cf. § 70) in a marginal note in three manuscripts and by Palladius, *Dial.* 20. 93–99 and Sozomen, *HE* 8.21.6–8; all report that the assassin was his servant.

228 The phrase Λημνία χειρὶς is otherwise known only from lexicographers, grammarians and paroemiographers, who all gloss the adjective as 'cruel and lawless'. It alludes to the familiar story that Lemnian women killed their husbands. The most fully preserved gloss states that they did so because their husbands 'were not making love to them' (*Suda* Λ 450 [3.264 Adler]).

of them. As the shouting intensified and was attracting a crowd, the attacker transformed his boldness into cowardice, began to move and, leaving the saint aside, started to kill those who were impeding his escape. Among them a man who had bathed at midday went to his grave instead of dining at table; for while those who were far off shouted to restrain the fugitive, he, being himself not far off, ran towards <the assassin> on what was to be his last race and by receiving a fatal blow transformed the expected feast to grief for his family. As they were scarcely able to stay the right hand of one who could strike such blows, the crowd ran to the house of the emperor shouting tearfully and displaying their wounds and the hand of the murderer still red with blood. But he sent them to the city prefect and did not want to look upon the violence himself. The prefect inflicted a few blows on him to mollify the people and dismissed the matter.²²⁹

107 Those who suffered such things, my friends, and who escaped death with great effort after being wounded on that occasion, have been in flight and persecution until today, while the assassin is splendidly attended by bodyguards in the midst of all <John's enemies> like a hero of the wars. Is there anyone among you who does not wish to discover for what reason, if both the just man prayed to end his life in the manner of a martyr and the Lord assented, he prevented the blow from being landed then? Because it is obvious to everyone that, if help had not come from <the Lord's> right hand, nothing²³⁰ would have prevented <John> from being killed then by the <assassin>.²³¹ Why then? Because he was waiting for the others to join him in his struggles; and because he thought that he ought to set a longer race for him, preparing for him a still more glorious crown of martyrdom.²³² Thirdly, in addition to these reasons, because he who sees all things before their birth (Susanna 35a = 42 Theodotion) knew that he would become a servant of his plan for the salvation of souls in cities situated far away. Also (if one must state the hidden reason) because even the church, which had been defiled by human blood, had to be washed clean by fire, which God allowed to happen²³³

229 The prefect of the city of Constantinople in the spring of 404, who made no serious attempt to punish the would-be assassin, was probably Simplicius (cf. *PLRE* 2.1014, Simplicius 4).

230 Wallraff prints οὐδ' ἄν, the reading offered by mss. K and P. But that leaves the verb ἐκώλυσε without an obvious subject, which we feel is too harsh even for this careless writer; M offers οὐδὲν ἄν, L bare οὐδέν.

231 We have made explicit the speaker's vague ὑπὸ θατέρου = 'by the other'.

232 Both the thought and the words echo a letter which John sent to Olympias at the end of 404 (*Letter to Olympias* 9.1a, lines 13–15).

233 The fire is described in § 112.

(in my opinion) for the reason which I have <just> stated and so that the body of adulterers would not defile that holy throne of our father.

108 These utter villains, who spared no trick to destroy the just man in any way at all, made their preparations. Let me explain how. When they saw him leaping over all the snares that they had set for him, they had recourse to the power of the emperor, asking him for a very unchristian favour.²³⁴ They emitted that <famous> cry of the Jews, saying: ‘Remove the man from our midst’ (Luke 23.18). When the emperor said: ‘What has he been convicted of doing,’ they said that they wanted his blood to lie on their heads.²³⁵ <The emperor>, receiving these words as having much good of sense, sent to our father through one of the notaries²³⁶ and ordered him to leave the city, saying that so-and-so and so-and-so (naming the lawbreakers Acacius and Antiochus, the footless and soon to be lifeless one, and the fellow from Gabala) had taken upon themselves <responsibility for> the condemnation.²³⁷ <The emperor told John> ‘please submit your case to God and be gone,’ and a threat was added both against him if he refused to do this and against any who tried to hold him back.

109 When <John> heard this, he said that he had done this long ago and had assigned judgment concerning all the things that he had suffered to God, but that he wished <the emperor> too to know that he had been wronged by him no less than by <his enemies>, since, although he had requested a formal trial, which is the legal right of even murderers, adulterers and sorcerers, he had received violence without a legal decision, without reason and against the law. Having said this and having made a single prayer in the church, he departed without anyone’s knowledge.²³⁸

234 Literally, a ‘favour alien to grace’ (χάριν ... χάριτος ἀλλοτριάν). We have found it impossible to reproduce the wordplay of the original Greek in English; for the wide range of meanings of χάρις in Christian texts, see Lampe 1514–18.

235 The exchange combines three moments from the trial of Christ in three different gospels: the crowd’s request to Pilate to crucify Jesus and release Barabbas (Luke 23.18); Pilate’s question to the Jewish leaders what their accusation was (John 18.39); and the alleged imprecation of the crowd that ‘his blood be upon us and our children’ (Matthew 27.25).

236 Presumably a member of the imperial *schola of tribuni et notarii* (Teitler 1985, 54–72).

237 Palladius, *Dial.* 9.19–33, names all four bishops. The punning Greek phrase ‘footless (ἄπουν) soon to be lifeless (ἄπνουν)’ refers to Quirinus (Cyrinus), the bishop of Chalcedon, who had one of his feet amputated after a Persian bishop, Marutha, accidentally stepped on it at the Council of the Oak. The amputation of his foot and subsequently of his whole leg did not halt the advance of gangrene and Quirinus died shortly after John’s expulsion from Constantinople (Socrates, *HE* 6.19.2–4; Sozomen, *HE* 8.27.2; cf. Palladius, *Dial.* 17.34–35).

238 John left Constantinople on 20 June 404 (Socrates, *HE* 6.18.18); in order to depart

SECOND EXILE AND RIOTS IN CONSTANTINOPE

110 When <John's enemies> discovered that everything had been completed for them according to plan and that the just man had been driven out by an imperial letter, they feared the justified anger²³⁹ of the masses and resorted to the wicked skill of Balaam (cf. Numbers 22–24, 31.16; 2 Peter 2.15–16). What did he do, when he saw that his tongue was being steered by divine guidance and that, though it had been hired for curses, it was being compelled to praise? Having in such a way offended King Balak, he gained his favour by the following plan, saying: 'This people, king, is invincible and unassailable because of God's help and it hates fornication and every unlawful union; if you want to lure them to such a sin, God who helps them will stand apart, and you will easily prevail over them.'

111 This then came about at the hands <of Balaam and Balak>, and <John's enemies> imitated them. For they expected to prevail over the congregation in no way other than by a misdeed of their own,²⁴⁰ because those in power had long ago been roused to anger against <John and his followers> in secret and would in that case have a reasonable and apparently plausible excuse for <open> anger. They secretly infiltrated destructive and unknown individuals and through them they scattered inflammatory words <among John's followers> designed to inflame anger. They said that it was just to set the city and the church ablaze when our father was being thrown out. I am persuaded that some of those who were <genuinely> ablaze with zeal were among those who did this; but from the freedom of speech which <John's enemies> as a group had taken against those who were for a time frightening to them, I am not convinced that it was <John's supporters> who alone started the fire.²⁴¹

112 The fire began in the late afternoon, and during the night, before morning arrived, the entire church was destroyed and that very beautiful

quietly, he had the mule on which he usually travelled saddled outside the west door of Hagia Sophia, out of which he slipped into the custody of waiting soldiers (Palladius, *Dial.* 10.68–82).

239 Literally, 'their sane/sensible madness' (τὴν σόφρονα μανίαν).

240 The *Funerary Speech* uses the noun *πλημμέλεια* in a sense favoured by John (e.g., *Homilies against the Jews* 4.3 [PG 48.876]: *παράνομία καὶ ἁμαρτία καὶ πλημμέλεια*). We suspect that there is a short lacuna and translate as if the text read <ἢ διὰ τῆς> *ἰδίας* *πλημμελείας*.

241 Socrates, *HE* 6.18.17, and Zosimus 5.24.3 both place the blame for the fire squarely on the 'Johannites' who could not countenance the appointment of a new bishop to replace him.

and great seat of the consuls,²⁴² with the church pointing with the edge of the fire, just as if with a finger, at the guilty neighbours. When day appeared, a strange mixture of pleasure and grief held those who beheld this event: of pleasure because the city was paying the price with the fire for wronging the just man, and of grief because they were being compelled to rejoice over these things, over which grief ought to be displayed, and the misfortune of the mother²⁴³ assuaged the loss of the father.

113 It was indeed remarkable. I myself saw the good judgment of the fire despite its insensate nature. For, since a legitimate treasure had been collected for the bride,²⁴⁴ at which those who were doubly sick with greed and adultery gaped, and the gold which was being consumed in the fire was going to become a pretext²⁴⁵ for slander against the just man, the fire advanced right up to the doors, but stopped its flame where these things were stored away, as if striving to sew up the mouths of the shameless men. Yet that storage vault was not adorned with metallic stone, but <carved> wooden builders' decorations supported and at the same time adorned the roof and walls. It was possible to see a most surprising sight: stones collapsing and wood resisting fire in defence of the just man. For if, after this had happened in this way and all the money had been saved, they did not spare their tongues, but said that <John> had taken everything beforehand, set fire to the church and fled, what would they not have said if the <treasures> had been consumed in the fire? What sort of blasphemy would they have hesitated to unloose against our father?²⁴⁶

114 They allowed the church to be consumed by the fire in complete silence, as if the event brought them a triumph over the saint. But they rushed to arrest the holy priests and the congregation whom they knew to be strongly opposed to their madness at that time. When they had filled the whole prison with them, <inflicting> mistreatment and threats of death, they sent a crowd

242 The fire broke out on the day of John's departure, 20 June 404, in the Church of Hagia Sophia and soon destroyed the entire building and the Senate House (Palladius, *Dial.* 10.83–121; Socrates, *HE* 6.18.17–18; Sozomen, *HE* 8.22.4–6; Zosimus 5.24.4; cf. Kelly 1995, 250–51).

243 That is, the Christian church (see Lampe 868–69, s.v. 2).

244 That is, John's church (Lampe 928, s.v. A).

245 John uses the noun πρόξενος and the related verb προξενεύω more than any other Greek writer (130 times in all), always in a metaphorical sense, as here.

246 Because the church treasury had been saved from the fire and the keepers of the treasury, Germanus and the deacon John Cassian, had kept records of its contents, John was exonerated from the charge of theft (Palladius, *Dial.* 3.90–95, 10.106–14).

of public executioners to the saint in order both to inspect what he had in his possession, thinking that they would discover a large quantity of gold, and to bring both him and all those with him to give an account of the evil acts which they themselves had done.²⁴⁷

115 As if the door had at last been opened for the adultery which they had long desired to commit, they led in to the title of bishop that old man, the skin of the present Athenian evil,²⁴⁸ whom the latter would not have allowed ahead of him then, had he had not, crafty fellow, feared the curses of the multitude. Moreover, he was convinced that the <old man> would live <only> a few days and would pass them in obedience to his orders.²⁴⁹

116 Of those who were arrested, they secretly (so certain individuals alleged)²⁵⁰ bound some to one another and abandoned to the current of the Bosphorus:²⁵¹ the waves of the sea cast their remains up on the shores. Others they wore down in prison by bombarding them from either side with threats and flattery – those who said that they would abide by the truth until their last breath with threats, those who were ready to kowtow to them and without saying or hearing anything just to enter into communion with the old man with flattery.

117 When those men returned who had searched the property of the just man finding <only> a small amount of silver coins, which had been taken without his knowledge by a domestic servant, they were unable to discover any excuse for a death sentence against him. <Hence> they sent him away to the most desolate village in Armenia (its name is Cucusus),²⁵² which the

247 Apparently on his journey to Cucusus, John addressed a letter ‘To the bishops, priests and deacons imprisoned in Chalcedon’ (*Ep.* 174M [PG 52. 711]). Although many were arrested, they were eventually exonerated (Palladius, *Dial.* 11.5–18; Sozomen, *HE* 8.22.7).

248 That is, Atticus. It is not clear to us why Arsacius is called his ‘skin’.

249 The two men are Arsacius and Atticus: Arsacius was consecrated bishop of Constantinople on 26 June 404, while Atticus was consecrated as his successor in March 406 (Socrates, *HE* 6.19.1, 20; Sozomen, *HE* 8.23.1). Arsacius was the younger brother of John’s predecessor Nectarius; according to Palladius he was ‘less vocal than a fish, less active than a frog’ (*Dial.* 11.18–20).

250 Palladius explicitly admits that the drowning of bishops was only a rumour; they had in fact been sent into various distant places of exile, where many were still being detained in 408 (*Dial.* 20.31–35).

251 We take Πόντου to be a proper name (the Black Sea) and the ‘current’ to be that of the straits between Constantinople and Chalcedon.

252 For the location of Cucusus (the modern Göksün), see W. Ruge, *RE* 11 (1922), 1065, s.v. Kokusos; *Barrington Atlas*, Maps 64 C4, 67CD 1 (Kokousus). Paul, who had been bishop

frequency of bandit raids did not allow to be a <proper> city, so that he might be worn down by the length of the journey, the proximity of bandits, isolation, hunger and countless other evils.²⁵³ The bishops, priests and all whom they found with <John> they led in chains and deposited in the prison of Chalcedon, respecting neither age or rank. For they had crowded all the prisons of the city <of Constantinople> with the large number of holy men.²⁵⁴

118 Next they composed a document which they wrote with a human hand, but I do not know whether it was <really> with a mind purified of demons, as it contained countless blasphemies against our father that befitted the Devil alone, and unlawful oaths on the holy Trinity and on the safety of the emperors, putting the fear of men and of God on the same level, that neither in prayer nor in a church service would they ever associate with the just man or ever hope for his return and that, if his return did come about, they would not wish to enter into communion with him. They carried this document around the forum: those who were willing to compose letters²⁵⁵ admitting these things and conforming <with them> on every point they released, but they arrested those who refused as having set fire to the church. Complete compulsion to act unlawfully against his will was laid on everyone; even if he was a stranger who had never ever seen the city or that church, and even if he had witnesses to prove it, he was led off by the public executioners for having set fire to the church. In short, at that time either sin or punishment attached to every home and each soul. For all those who hated illegality and did not spare the expense also fled.

119 Next accusations against distant priests were gathered and lodged. The good inevitably had the bad as enemies, while the bad readily opened the mouths of those who were willing. They summoned each one and said: 'Do you see, my brother? You are accused of adultery, sorcery, pederasty and of having misspent the holy monies of the church. You need one thing for complete victory over those who hate these things: come with us, join

of Constantinople in the late 340s, was sent to Cucusus where he met his death (Barnes 1993, 213–17). In his account of Paul, Theodoret describes Cucusus as a πόλισμα σμυρρόν which had once been part of Cappadocia, but was in Armenia Secunda in the 440s (*HE* 2.5.2–3). In his account of John's exile he uses a slightly different formulation, which has verbal similarities to this passage (*HE* 5.33.7 ~ § 117).

253 On conditions in Cucusus, see John, *Epp.* 108–11M, 194M = *Letter I B&B*; Palladius, *Dial.* 11.14–17; Sozomen, *HE* 8.22.6.

254 §§ 114, 116.

255 The verb 'engrave' in ἐγγράζει γράμματα implies that the letters were written on wax tablets.

in killing²⁵⁶ and all is resolved.’ Those who were aware that they had done some of the things mentioned above, purchased their escape with injustice, thinking it to be no terrible thing to mix mud with their many stains, and unlawful communion with a corrupt life. Those who were pure of heart and looked with their mind’s eye upon the judgment that is to come, estimated the violence against our father from what they themselves were suffering, and held fast to the truth themselves even though <John’s enemies> both threatened and carried out depositions. But the conventicle <of the latter> was always increasing, on the one hand from those whom they installed in the churches of those who refused to break the law, on the other from those who had been ejected a long time ago at holy councils on the gravest of charges.²⁵⁷

120 They were doing such things so that in every way they might drive the priesthood away from mankind, since those who held it justly were being expelled, while those who neither had it nor ought to obtain it were being enrolled, as were others who had held it but had lost it because of an offence concerning the just man. Nevertheless, knowing that they held nothing securely, they asked the emperor to dispatch letters over the whole world to the effect that those of the bishops who refused to be in communion with the old man should be both ejected from the church and deprived of what they happened to possess either through their own efforts or as inherited wealth. In this way they trapped many against their will, who considered it nothing to buy release from such great afflictions at the price of a single sin.²⁵⁸

121 When much time had passed and the evils were continually rising to an ever greater height, another arrow of the Lord again hit the woman, no longer saying ‘in pain’, but ‘in death, woman, shall you bear children’ (Genesis 3.16).²⁵⁹ It loosed against her a painful, many-headed illness that virtually spoke and said: ‘This is the finger of God’ (Exodus 8.19). All the

256 Literally, ‘join in blood’ (κοινωνήσον αἵματος).

257 Probably an allusion to the conflict in Antioch over the successor to Flavianus, who died in 404 (Kelly 1995, 252).

258 The *Funerary Speech* probably alludes to the full text of either *CTh* 16.2.37, dated 29 August 404 and addressed to the city prefect Studius, or *CTh* 16.4.6, dated 18 November 404 and addressed to the praetorian prefect Eutychianus. Two later laws are recorded by Palladius, *Dial.* 11.31–53, 3.64–68: the first, a rescript which Atticus obtained shortly after he became bishop of Constantinople in March 406, threatened expulsion from the church and confiscation of property for both bishops and laity who refused communion with him, Theophilus of Alexandria or Porphyrius, the bishop of Antioch; the second was an edict of similar tenor, which Palladius himself took to Rome when he escaped from the eastern capital.

259 For the first arrow, see § 66.

skill of doctors was inferior to it and all thought of solace was destroyed. Behold! There was a dead infant inside her, buried in its mother's womb, which blocked the passage of foods, turned what was recently ingested into nauseous bile, forced bitter fluid to rush back up to her throat, and by the weight of the body thrust what had long lain in the stomach down to her lower parts with a great rushing. Next, as may be expected to happen with a dead body, floods of worms also teemed forth,²⁶⁰ some quivering on top of the head of the unseen corpse and causing vomiting of the undigested food, others under its feet making the efflux of the belly sharper and agonizingly painful, and sometimes also oozing out with the mass of blood flowing out. In addition, a fever seized the whole of the rest of her body, short of being a fire only in not being visible, and all sleep, as you know, shuns the eyes of the delirious.

Those who were there say that she often leapt up and suddenly burst out: 'Why do you attack me, John?' Nevertheless, her heart was hardened as she hastened towards her final punishment. She summoned the old man,²⁶¹ and by nodding her head requested holy communion²⁶² and prayer: this was the only sin she had not yet committed. As soon as she received them, she miscarried, so that <those present> said with joy that a great sign had been wrought for the old man and they even recited a collective chant²⁶³ giving thanks for what had already happened and praying for the future. As they were doing this, she took the infant in her arms and vomited out her soul together with the communion <that she had> only just <received>. Still breathing and half-alive, she filled the sensory organs of those standing around with stench that surpassed the plants of India and the flies of Persia and virtually all the skill of those who busy themselves with such things, with her suffering suggesting nothing else than that <the baby> had long been among the dead. In this way she brought her life to a close.²⁶⁴

260 The expression, 'streams of worms', was a phrase used almost exclusively by John Chrysostom (24 out of a total of 30 occurrences registered in the *TLG*). In his homily *Cum Saturninus et Aurelianus acti essent in exilium* (*CPG* 4393) John used the same combination of four words as here (*PG* 52. 418: καὶ πηγαὶ σκολήκων ἔβρουν).

261 Arsacius, the successor of John as bishop of Constantinople.

262 For this concrete meaning of *κοινωνία*, see Lampe 763–64, s.v. C.

263 For the different senses of the noun in the phrase *λιταναίαν συνάγειν* at this period, see Lampe 804.

264 Eudoxia died on 6 October 404 (*Chr. Pasch.* 569 Bonn = pp. 59–60 Whitby and Whitby). The prototype of gleeful accounts of the painful death of a ruler who had persecuted the worshippers of the true God is the account of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 2 Maccabees 9.5–28; Nestle 1948; Heck 1987, 118–19.

122 The war against the church, to which that woman had given birth, was taken over by another, a sub-female, who counted as neither man nor woman, who rejoiced in lasciviousness, who had been bought with hides, who was the Devil's equal in overweening arrogance, who resembled a scorpion in the smallness of his body and the sharpness of his sting, but surpassed <the Devil> in his love of money, avarice and insatiable fondness for childish thoughts.²⁶⁵ He removed from office the previous prefect <of the city>, who had been restraining most of their mad actions by the mildness of his character, and installed another who had long desired the blood of Christians and at this point discovered an opportunity by which he sated his own madness and judged that he was gaining favour with those who had honoured him.²⁶⁶

123 This <prefect> put everything else aside, as if the Roman empire was tottering over this matter, and all day and night he lacerated with tortures those who denied that they had any intimate knowledge of the saint, making a show²⁶⁷ of investigating the burning of the church, while trying in any way to persuade everyone to say that the act had really been perpetrated by the just man. Of course, while they were being tortured and flayed, others flattered them and at the same time urged them to say what <John's enemies> wanted in order to obtain speedy release from their ill-treatment, adding to their speeches: 'What benefit did John ever bring you? What benefit will he bring you after his recall? How then is it not both absurd and mad to endure so many tortures for the sake of a man for no gain at all, either obvious or expected?' For, since they had found no pretext for the illegality against the father, they wished to fix this false accusation²⁶⁸ on him, supposing that through this they would show that he had justly been subjected to sufferings before <the fire>, as if there would be some men so witless as to accept an accusation, even if it were <not> true, against an absent man.²⁶⁹

265 The eunuch Antiochus, who was a *cubicularius* in 404 and later rose to be *praepositus sacri cubiculi* (PLRE 2.101–02, Antiochus 5). On his career, see the partly speculative reconstruction by Greatrex and Bardill 1996, who argue that he came from Persia and joined the imperial court in Constantinople in 402 or 403.

266 The two prefects of the city of Constantinople are Paianius, who was a friend and supporter of John, and the pagan Optatus (§§ 125, 131 with n.280); on their prefectures, see our introduction to John's letters, section 2.

267 The adverb δῆθεν normally carries an ironic or sarcastic overtone (LSJ 384, s.v. 2).

268 Sc. of starting the fire.

269 Logic requires that a negative be inserted into this clause.

124 Observe the Devil's trap: he opened this readiness for falsehood that those who wanted to serve it were released free from every charge: they became friends with the prefect, so that they were allowed to enter his court at any time and to both say and do whatever they wanted, and in addition they had an abundance of money from the one who had obtained the right to spend the property of the church in this fashion. But he invented such disagreeable consequences for the truth that great firmness was needed to withstand the flattery and insults, not to mention the tortures. For neither hooks nor leather whips, not the rack, not fire, not iron, nor any other form of torture was spared on those who honoured the truth, nor even a flattering tongue that called them stupid and mocked their steadfastness in these circumstances.

125 Against all these things a countless number resisted, and the blessed Eutropius reached the finishing line and was crowned <with martyrdom>, a young man in age and delicate in body, but who showed in action that honourable old age is not a matter of many years and that the grey hairs do not constitute wisdom, but that wisdom constitutes old age (cf. Wisdom 4.8–9). <Eutropius> provoked that abominable man²⁷⁰ to greater anger against him through his great faith. For, while he was being led in by the hands of the public executioners, he asked that his right hand be released a little and armed himself with the sign of the cross. Seeing this and calling the action an insult against himself, <the prefect> stood up and would almost have done the job of the executioners. But since he was hindered by physical infirmity, he shouted out the suffering of his soul with a yell and used the executioners as his doctors. And showing involuntarily what he was trying to combat, he ordered that the limbs of the blessed man which had received the sign of the cross (they were his forehead and his breast) be flayed with hooks, not knowing, the fool, that an indelible cross was engraved in the faith of the heart of a man who was showing himself more resolute and courageous towards his travails.²⁷¹

126 And while these things were happening inside <the prefect's court>, the congregation ran together to the church of the Acheiropoietos,²⁷² coming

270 Sc. Optatus.

271 Eutropius (above, § 33) was a cantor in the church of Constantinople who was brutally tortured to force him to reveal the names of those who had burned down the church and died from his tortures without disclosing any information (Palladius, *Dial.* 20.99–106; Sozomen, *HE* 8.24.1).

272 The text is clear (ἐπὶ τὴν ἀχειροποίητον ἐκκλησίαν); the late Byzantine *patria* of Constantinople often attributed to George Codinus asserts that Constantine founded the church (Preger 1907, 260), but this is normally dismissed as an obvious anachronism (Janin 1953,

out often with the very same soldiers who were about to lead them in chains to the magistrate. And those who were not yet bound, seeing those who preceded them, escorted them to the prison with songs of praise and vied to participate with them in their travails.

127 When these things were reported to the just man,²⁷³ tears flowed down his cheeks, his skin wasted away and his tongue uttered the <famous> words of David, though in a different situation. For David, who had truly sinned and afterwards saw his people paying the penalty for his sin, said: 'I the shepherd have sinned and I the shepherd have done evil; why then are the flocks perishing instead of me?' (2 Samuel 24.17; 1 Chronicles 21.17). But <John>, who knew that he had committed no sin in the matter, nevertheless in order to spare his children said: 'The injustice lies in me. Why do they lead people to death? <Are they not doing that> in order to prove me liable to death? Behold! I now, cry out in a clear voice: I set fire to the church; let them burn me in return; only please spare my children.'

128 Together with the recollection of David, the recollection has come to me of his son Solomon (1 Kings 3.16–28). For <Solomon> once issued such a judgment as ought to have been rendered also in the case of our father, though it was not made because of the difference between the judges. What was the judgment of Solomon? It would not be a bad thing to recount it among you who already know. When the glory of philosophy was flowering in him – wisdom knows how to flower together with piety, because without <the latter> it would justly be called foolishness or rather madness –, at that time two women approached him (so the story goes) holding newborn infants, one whom they both claimed and another who had died and whom both rejected. Both infants were in swaddling clothes and both mothers had given birth in the same house. It was not possible for the judge to distinguish as yet which mother had given birth to the living child by any recognizable features or by calling his name because he was only a few days old. So what did Solomon do? Pretending to be unjust, he tracked down the injustice and, by ordering with his lips alone that the infants be cut in two and divided between the two women, he discovered <which was> the mother of the living child. For the one gladly agreed to this illegal division because she was not <the mother>, while the one who was really the mother shed streams of tears and said: 'I did not run to the knees of the king for this purpose, my child, but rather I sought justice in order to have you recognized

273 That is, John.

as my own child, not to kill you.²⁷⁴ For I did not know that the just Solomon would give such a verdict. What then ought I, your wretched mother, do? I shall yield the infant to this woman: let him be called not mine for a little while, so that he may remain permanently mine. Let him be nourished on another mother's milk and not be cut in two.' And she cried out to Solomon, saying: 'I am not the mother of the living child, king. Since I am a mother, let this woman, who claims to have borne him, have the infant.' On the other side, <the other woman> tried to throw everything into confusion by crying out to the king and saying: 'You have judged correctly, o King; the judgment does you honour, the killing crowns you <with glory>; you legislate piously and you show piety in slaughtering. Let this law be inscribed across the entire world: "Whoever has a child, let her divide it and share it with a woman who does not have <a child>." I praise the law, although I am being wronged, and I accept the judgment. Why is the sword so slow? The executioner is doing me wrong. Public executioners need <people>²⁷⁵ on whom to hone their bestiality. Add to the harshness of their character the eagerness <produced by> pain. Truly, there has been no-one like you and there will not be after you.' To this Solomon said: 'You will not take me in with your flatteries, woman, nor will I grant you what belongs to another because of your encomia. For your lack of pity for the infant seems to me to exclude you from kinship with it. So be gone and take your child, the dead one, and cut it up as you want at home, gratify your envy and go to war with nature.'

129 Until the judgment itself, then, the present case was similar to what I have described. For our father yielded his own people to those who desired them and he added, if they wanted it, his own life out of loving affection for his children. But the other, master of those of whom he had become master contrary to reason and of those whom he had not <become master>, since they were uncorrupted and were seeking the voice of our father, considered that the hands of the public executioners should destroy everyone. But the results of the judgment <in the two cases> were utterly different. For the one who spared his children, even though he was truly their father, was driven out, while this fellow who had murderous desires against them, was reckoned to be their father. For the one who sat in judgment on that occasion

274 The sentence puns on the different meanings of the Greek verb ἀναίωω: in the active voice it means 'destroy', in the middle voice to acknowledge a newborn child as legitimate (LSJ 106, s.v. A II, B 1, 4).

275 The Greek has δημίων ('executioners') which makes no sense, since logic requires a reference to the executioners' victims; the easiest emendation is the punning δῆμιον ('people').

was not the young Solomon, the child of David, but that old man, the son of Astarte.²⁷⁶

130 The prefect, as if made inferior to the nature of the male sex not through the truth itself, but rather because of his own cowardice, ran to the female sex and, after receiving information from them, selected those women who would, he was convinced, by the weakness of their nature and the avarice of their mind be able to defraud the truth. Among them the fool counted even that marvellous woman, if indeed one ought to call her a woman who personally in wisdom and strength exceeded human nature by a great measure – Olympias, the new Phoebe (cf. Romans 16.1–2), who wisely practised²⁷⁷ virginity in widowhood, poverty in wealth and wealth in poverty, who always divested herself of what she possessed for Christ, as if beginning with a full jar (1 Kings 17.14, 16), who assumed the resoluteness of a man and surpassed all human understanding despite her female and delicate body.²⁷⁸ If one saw her, one might easily pass her by noticing <only> the modesty of her attire and stature and taking no heed of the wealth hidden in the cheap folds <of her garments>, just as one might overlook a pearl <hidden> in an oyster.²⁷⁹ As soon as one heard her speak, however, one would marvel at the great floods of wisdom flowing quietly along, imitating the greatest of rivers, whose surface resembles ice and whose fury is hidden in their depths. If one probed and discovered her <true> life, one would say not only that she possessed virtues, but that she herself was one of the virtues, such as moderation, mildness, continence or (what is a truer and closer approximation <to perfect virtue>) humility, which makes each of the others a genuine virtue.

276 Astarte, whom the Septuagint derides as ‘the abomination of the Sidonians’ (III Regnorum 11.6, 11.33 = 2 Kings 11.5, 11.33), was the Phoenician goddess *par excellence* (Bonnet 1996). Optatus was a pagan (Socrates, *HE* 6.18.19); the phrase ‘son of Astarte’ implies that he came from Phoenicia.

277 We are not quite certain of the significance of the use of the middle voice here, but John uses the verb σοφίζω more often than any other Greek author.

278 Palladius, *Dial.* 16.186–87, has a similar description of Olympias’ nature: ‘Do not say “woman” but rather “manly creature”’. She is a man in everything but body.’ Both rich and of high social status, Olympias, who was born in 361, was the grand-daughter of Constantine’s praetorian prefect Ablabius, the niece of a woman who had been betrothed to Constantine’s youngest son Constans, and the widow of man who had been *praefectus urbis Constantinopolitanae* under Theodosius (*Life of Olympias* 2; cf. *PLRE* 1.642–43, Olympias 2; Clark 1979, 108–16, 121–25).

279 The simile echoes John’s observation, in a homily on Paul’s letter to the Colossians, that ‘the pearl is hidden as long as it is in the oyster’ (*PG* 62.346).

131 <Optatus>,²⁸⁰ as if really denouncing piety itself, seized her, leapt from the judge's seat in anger, unfurled his garments, broke his writing-reeds and showered her with countless reproaches like someone who had gone mad and was calling the sun dark, rock unstable and calm weather a storm. By uttering such words and finally imposing a fine on her of many talents of gold, he thus assuaged his anger a little. <So> after taking the property of the poor, they drove the woman who cared for them out of the city in their eagerness to strip what was then a city, but is now a citadel, of all charitable gift-giving.²⁸¹

132 If it were my purpose to narrate the evil deeds of these people, my story would be destined to use up not only the present day, but countless other days. As it is, however, I have promised to deposit in your ears today the unblemished and spotless life of our father. Why then has the speech led me to these things <which I have just described>? Because, my friends, I have been weaving from them the greatest encomium and braiding a crown for the just man. How? When there was set in motion against him every plot, blasphemy, insult, calumny, deceit and conspiracy known to man, when the priestly and the imperial power combined, each using every device <of trickery>, when the whole world was shaken, when no ear or tongue remained untouched by the machinations against him, when his deposition had been proclaimed and had brought forth fires, when rulers and ruled alike – all the people, bishops, emperors themselves, military officers and armies – when these tried with all their might to throw blame on him, he alone, sitting in silence, enjoyed the pleasure that comes from victory, since no-one was able to convict him of wrongdoing. Hence I believe that the Lord constantly stood by him in the midst of his afflictions and said: 'Do you think that I would concern myself with you except that you might show yourself just?' (John 8.46).

280 The Greek has the bare demonstrative pronoun 'that man' (ἐκεῖνος). What follows indicates that he must be Optatus, who was prefect of the city of Constantinople and a pagan (see our introduction to John's letters, section 2). We detect an allusion to Optatus' paganism in the phrase 'as if really denouncing piety itself' (ὥσπερ αὐτῆς ἀληθῶς τῆς εὐσεβείας καταβοῶν, where αὐτῆς must be emphatic, not possessive).

281 For this meaning of εὐλογία, see Lampe 570, s.v. F. Optatus had brought Olympias before the commission investigating the fire of 20/21 June and accused her of starting it, to which she retorted that one who had given so much money for building a church would not then burn it down. Optatus offered Olympias and the deaconesses who attended her freedom from any further investigations if they acknowledged Arsacius as the lawful bishop of Constantinople and, when she refused, he fined her the huge sum of 200 pounds of gold and relegated her to Nicomedia (*Life of Olympias* 9–10; Sozomen, *HE* 8.24.4–7).

TOWARDS MARTYRDOM

133 But the time summons us to the martyrdom of our father, a martyrdom that crowns our father through the nature of the event and proclaims God's complete wisdom, his fine planning and his ability to discover paths in pathless places. That the saint prayed to be found worthy of such a crown, although it was not the right time for this, because impiety had been repulsed and piety had been extended across the entire world, and that there was found some such manner of martyrdom which men clad in the skins of sheep²⁸² accomplished involuntarily – how can this, my friends, not be believed to be the work of the wisdom and strength of God?

How then was this crown <of martyrdom> braided for him?

134 When all matters were at this point which I have mentioned, the old man departed from both lives, from that life in this and from this life together with that.²⁸³ After him came the man who made use of his predecessor to do what appeared to be <the policy> of his predecessor <but was really his own>, thinking that he was unobserved, but in fact escaping no-one's notice.²⁸⁴ This man, the present bishop, who <seemed> sweet and plausible to the foolish, and was full of flattery, persuading everyone that he knew nothing of what he had then done (it being necessary to swear to know nothing of the things that he said at that time), the demon from Athens,²⁸⁵ the symbol of Attic superstition, a man struck by a double report²⁸⁶ — on the one hand, <he heard> about the successes of the saint, which he was accomplishing although he was confined in a wilderness, <rescuing> countless souls, ransoming some from the hands of barbarians with the small and impoverished means that he had, snatching others away from the snares of the Devil with the words that he possessed in rich abundance having acquired them through toil and grace, sustaining others who were

282 The proverbial 'wolves in sheep's clothing' (Matthew 7.15).

283 In other words, when Arsacius died on 11 November 405 (Palladius, *Dial.* 11.22–23; Socrates, *HE* 6.20.1; Sozomen, *HE* 8.27.3), he had by his actions on earth ('this life') forfeited eternal life in heaven ('that life').

284 The same accusation against Atticus, who became bishop of Constantinople in March 406, is made by Palladius, *Dial.* 11.31; Socrates, *HE* 6.20.2; Sozomen, *HE* 8.27.3.

285 This is mere word-play on his name (cf. § 115): Atticus was in fact born in Sebaste in Armenia and educated by monks belonging to the Macedonian heresy (Socrates, *HE* 7.2; Sozomen, *HE* 8.27.4–7).

286 Since we cannot find a main verb in this rambling sentence, we mark an anacolouthon and supply one.

fighting exile and hunger through the grain of the holy widow (1[3] Kings 17.14, 16), and planting monasteries in regions that had <previously> been habituated to murders and robberies – all of which almost transplanted the entire city of Antioch to <join> him.²⁸⁷ On the other hand, <he heard> about the most correct decision of the Romans, who convened a large number of bishops,²⁸⁸ who all, though they were many and advanced in age, wished to rush immediately to Constantinople in their desire for peace, but decided that it was better first to entrust the matter to a few and, having selected five bishops and two priests from great Rome by vote, despatched them together with the bishops who had come from <the East> as ambassadors to them to ask the emperor for nothing more than the announcement of a council, the setting of its agenda,²⁸⁹ and a time and place for the council.

135 And when <Atticus> saw himself swamped by the news on both fronts as if by a massive wave and that <John> was being elevated to a great height of virtue and reputation, while the others²⁹⁰ were pressing and claiming that it was completely necessary that there be a council and that the ruler of the West, the brother of the <eastern emperor>, had resolved on it, what did he do? Having covertly approached the general hostile to the church whom I mentioned a little earlier,²⁹¹ he persuaded him to send some back in dishonour, as if they were trespassing on foreign territory, and to transport the easterners²⁹² who had requested their help into exile, on the grounds that they had insulted the majesty and decision of the eastern emperor,²⁹³ and to

287 On John's activities in exile, see Palladius, *Dial.* 11.63–95 with Kelly 1995, 253–71.

288 Palladius is the only other ancient author to record that the council which the western emperor Honorius convened in Rome to consider the matters which Innocentius, the bishop of Rome, had brought to his attention, actually met; the council asked Honorius to write to his brother to request that a council of bishops from both East and West be held in Thessalonica (*Dial.* 3.115–32; Sozomen, *HE* 8.28.1, records the request).

289 The Greek is once more imprecise; despite the standard use of the noun *horos* for the decisions of church councils (Lampe 1975, s.v. C), we take it here to refer to the agenda of the proposed council, which was normally set by the emperor(s) who convened councils of bishops (Barnes 1993, 170–73).

290 That is, the delegation of bishops sent from Rome.

291 The speaker refers back to the *comes* who arrested John after the Council of the Oak (§ 57), who is not to be identified as the Valerianus of Palladius, *Dial.* 4.36–37, 57–58 (see above, n.137).

292 Literally, 'those from here' (τοὺς ἐνθὲνδε), contrasted with 'the imperial majesty and decision here' (τὴν ἐνθάδε ... βασιλείαν τε καὶ κρίσιν).

293 Palladius, who was himself a member of this delegation, preserves a full account of it (*Dial.* 4.16–68; 20.107–79). The ten envoys were refused entry to Illyricum, then separated into easterners and westerners and forced to sail on to Constantinople, where they were denied entry

devise for the saint himself a most cruel manner of death, brought about not by iron, but by what was much more cruel than iron – long forced marches and illness imposed on natural frailty of the body.²⁹⁴ No sooner had they planned these things than they were put into effect. The measures regarding the other <bishops> took the form which that man dictated: then for the first time the law concerning ambassadors was trampled underfoot – and ambassadors who were bishops²⁹⁵ and priests, and who were serving on an embassy to do with the peace of the church and general concord.

136 Public executioners were again²⁹⁶ dispatched by the quickest route, who were boiling with youthful fervour and aflame with a desire for gain which the profit of the business displayed to their gaze, to kill the just man in whatever manner they wished. When they returned, they announced the death of our father. But because they describe the manner of his death in different ways, they do not persuade us to envisage any coherent account of it, as if either having killed him they are afraid to proclaim their deed or they have returned after hiding him in order to release the people from the charm that surrounded him by the rumour of his death.²⁹⁷ If then he still survives, my brothers, we shall see him at some time sitting on the throne like Joseph and distributing with spiritual sustenance to all (Genesis. 41.56, 42–45); but if he has really migrated to the true life and has returned to the longed-for Christ, we have a martyr to serve as an intercessor for us.²⁹⁸

137 When <Atticus> received the longed-for news and added pleasure to his swollen body, he donned the garb of philanthropy and began to trot around to everyone, to anoint and to soothe with words those whom he had torn to pieces through his actions, to give silver to those in need, to prostrate himself and clasp the knees of those who were convinced that he had nothing else to offer, beseeching them to dissolve their hatred towards

to the city and confined in two separate groups. Although the westerners were unceremoniously sent home again, the Greek delegates were sent into exile (Kelly 1995, 277–81).

294 The emperor ordered that John be moved under guard to the even more remote Pityus on the north-east coast of the Black Sea (Theodoret, *HE* 5.34.7–8; Sozomen, *HE* 8.28.2; cf. *Barrington Atlas*, Map 87 F1).

295 Literally, ‘fathers’; on this use of the word, compare §§ 74, 77, 100.

296 For the earlier occasion, see above § 114. These ‘executioners’ were in fact ‘soldiers of the praetorian prefect’ of the East (Palladius, *Dial.* 11.101–02; Sozomen, *HE* 8.28.2).

297 On the circumstances surrounding John’s death at Comana Pontica on 14 September 407 (App. C), see Introduction, section 1, at nn.22–24.

298 This chapter fixes the date of the *Funerary Speech* as shortly after 14 September 407, most probably October or early November 407.

him (which was just) and secretly to enter into a friendship with him (which was unjust). I myself would gladly have said to him: ‘Tyrant (for you appear to me to enjoy being addressed by such a name because of what you are attempting), with what objective in view²⁹⁹ do you apply medications to wounds that you have inflicted? Or, because you know how to flatter, did you deliberately cause pain before so that you might have an opportunity to practise your skill, acting exactly like a doctor who, having gathered countless herbs and fastened them with a rag, might carry this in his left hand, strike a man with a club in his right hand and say to him: “Cheer up, my dear friend, I have the remedy in my hands.” But he would justifiably reply: “You villain, why are you manufacturing my need for medicine? How will I entrust to you the healing of an already weakened body, which you received healthy, but have reduced to such a wretched state?”’

138 And so it seems to me that those who are entering into communion with <his enemies> because the blessed man has passed away have for a long time been urging them to murder him and are teaching everyone <who comes> after these events (and it is likely that many will be revealed as such, since such is life) that, whenever they want to drive away a just man and the matter troubles and scatters the flocks, they kill him quickly so that the flocks are reunited by his killing. What do you say, my good fellow? You were not in communion because of the injustice: are you in communion after the murder, as if the murder has erased the injustice? Or did you hate Jezebel until the seizure of Naboth’s vineyard on this account,³⁰⁰ but when she killed him, did you give up your hatred towards her at the same time as he <gave up his> life? (1 Kings 21.1–16). ‘What can we do,’ he replies, ‘when the man has died?’ Wait for the just judgment from Christ: it will surely happen, let no one doubt it. For the Lord is not accustomed to confine the outcome of their actions within the life of men. On the contrary, he likes rather to create the preludes of <blessings>³⁰¹ from their complete despair.

I will provide testimony of such things from divine Scripture.

139 Once upon a time a wicked beast devoured Joseph, according to the story of his brothers to their father. He, who had actually been sold, although alleged to have been devoured (Genesis 37), had those who had said the one thing and done the other in his power and he saw them prostrating

299 Literally, ‘with what sort of eyes’ (ποίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς).

300 Sc. for her unjust actions. For the assimilation of Eudoxia’s hostility towards John to Jezebel’s treatment of Naboth, see § 34.

301 The Greek has the colourless ‘of such things’ (τῶν τοιούτων).

themselves as they received the interpretation of ancient dreams (Genesis 42–45), and, after his death had been believed by his father, he met in royal chariots the one who had grieved over him (Genesis 45.19; 46.5, 29).

140 Again, by his death this same Joseph allowed his entire family, which had expanded to a large number of individuals, to endure harsh slavery in Egypt (Exodus 1.6–14). Nonetheless, because of his death no Israelite became an Egyptian, but, after remaining in slavery for a short time, they returned to the most manifest liberty through Moses; and all of creation later bowed in obeisance to those to whom no respite from their toils had previously been permitted, when God, who loves mankind, had made the sea dry land for them as they crossed it (Exodus 14), made the waterless desert a sea when they thirsted (Exodus 17.1–17), and rained heaven-grown bread on them when they were stretching out their hands for food (Exodus 16). Again, when these people did not have a city, a marketplace or a dwelling, but were herded together in the great desert, the popular leader Moses was reunited with his fathers.³⁰² What then did those who expected to recover their promised inheritance through him need to do? Tell me: to return to Egypt in despair? Joshua would have laughed at their stupidity – <Joshua> who took over the task of Moses (Deuteronomy 31.1–8) and captured the walled cities of the gentiles, now by the sound of trumpets, now by the mere expectation of his arrival, and who saw some who had been in need of clever tricks undergo the yoke so that they were slaves to him (Joshua 6–12).

141 There was a time when Elijah used to say that he alone had been left (1 Kings 19.10), but he discovered a hundred prophets maintaining themselves in the caves (1 Kings 18.4, 13). And he heard the Lord say: ‘I left behind for myself seven thousand men, who did not bend their knees to Baal’ (1 Kings 19.18). And later, when he himself mounted that <famous> chariot and rose to heaven on wings of fire (2 Kings 2.11), he had Elisha displaying Elijah in his person, and something even more important which he desired: Elisha was somehow now completely hidden after receiving the cloak of his <spiritual> father (2 Kings 2.12–15).

142 What, please tell me, if you had been alive at the time of our Saviour’s presence on earth, if you had then, in the company of the apostles, watched

302 This circumlocution for ‘died’ occurs several times in the Septuagint (Judges 2.10; 2 Kings 22.20; 2 Chronicles 34.28; 1 Maccabees 2.69; Bel and the Dragon 1). Palladius, *Dial.* 11.146, uses it for John himself in a passage which assimilates his death to that of Moses (Malingrey and Leclercq 1988, 229 n.4).

him being crucified, if you had those who nailed him <to the cross> addressing <you> and if you were listening to their flattery and their claims that after death it is necessary that all problems be set aside, would you then, please tell me, have approached the apostles and tried to persuade them to hurry to Caiphas, to praise the deed and to kiss that right hand which had slain Christ? You would in no way have persuaded them, but in doing this you would have deprived yourself of the gift of the Spirit and of countless good things, 'that the eye has not seen, that the ear has not heard, and that have not risen to the heart of man' (1 Corinthians 2.9), which the crucified one's love of humanity has bestowed on us.

143 Accordingly, now too, my brothers, it is in no way holy to despair of the support of God. It is necessary to say to ourselves in conclusion the words of those ancient youths, modifying them only slightly, that: there is a God in heaven who suffices to punish the unjust and to protect our herd (cf. Daniel 3.17–18). Even if <God does> not <punish them>, let it be known to all people that there will be no communion between men who have been murdered and their killers, nor will we allow ourselves to approach a sacrifice which a heart has performed that still has murderous desires towards us, or a tongue and hand stained crimson with the blood of the just man and his children.

144 But, wondrous father, 'press on, have a good journey and rule' (Psalm 44.5): set foot in the royal halls of Christ, lightening our bereavement with your memory, pray constantly and entreat your and our lord Christ, who has invested you with the desired crown of martyrdom, that we may walk in the footsteps of your virtue and be deemed worthy of the same <heavenly> portion as you in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be glory and power now and forever to all eternity. Amen.

JOHN'S LETTERS FROM EXILE

INTRODUCTION

After his expulsion from Constantinople in 404, John could no longer deliver sermons to a live audience as he had been in the habit of doing since 386. From exile, however, he began to send letters to friends and acquaintances in the imperial capital who might be able to mitigate the harsh conditions which he was enduring, and to many others. Hence there is a remarkable contrast between John's literary output before his exile and after his final departure from Constantinople: while no letters written or dictated by John are preserved from the first fifty-five or so years of his life, about 240 survive from his last three-and-a-quarter years, the earliest sent from Nicaea within a few days of his expulsion from Constantinople on 20 June 404.¹

1. THE PRESENT SELECTION OF LETTERS

Some years ago Ann-Marie Malingrey, who had edited John's 17 *Letters to Olympias* and translated them into elegant French, asked Roland Delmaire to cast a historian's eye over all of John's surviving letters in preparation for a new edition of his complete correspondence (which has not yet appeared). In response Delmaire produced a thorough study of the chronology and prosopography of John's letters which included an alphabetical list of everyone named therein.² This has provided the basis of our discussion of the recipients of John's letter in the next section.

We have selected and translated into English 30 letters which John wrote from exile to recipients other than Olympias, only one of which has (to the best of our knowledge) previously been translated into English (*Letter X* = 197M to Studius). The 30 letters which we have translated are not (and were never intended to be) a representative selection of the corpus of John's letters, since we have excluded almost all the letters that John wrote to

1 *Letters to Olympias* 1, 2, 4, cf. App. F.

2 Delmaire 1991, 71–180, esp. 103–73.

sympathizers, admirers and well-wishers in eastern Asia Minor and Syria, for which we refer readers to John Kelly's brief but enlightening survey.³ We have selected letters in two main categories: (1) letters addressed to prominent persons in Constantinople, and (2) letters to important western bishops other than Innocentius and to three aristocratic Roman ladies, all written in the hope of bolstering political support for John in the West. We have decided to offer only minimal commentary on individual letters for two reasons: first, most of what needs to be said in each case can be found in our discussion of the recipients of the letters; and second, the letters themselves, which are rather repetitious, derive their significance mainly from John's reiteration of a relatively small number of recurring themes.

When John reached his initial place of exile in September 404, he announced his arrival at Cucusus to a number of men who had supported him in Constantinople before his exile and asked them to write to him (*Letters* I–II, IV–VII),⁴ and he thanked Carterius, the governor of Cappadocia Secunda, for ensuring his safety by protecting him when he passed through Caesarea on his way to Cucusus, inviting him too to write a letter (*Letter* III). After this initial batch of letters, there is hardly a letter to an addressee in Constantinople that does not in some way request a letter or comment on the addressee's failure to reply or to write to John. Some letters are little more than reproaches for the addressee's silence (*Letters* XI, XXV), while several others beseech the addressee to send John information about his health (*Letters* VIII, XV, XVII, XX) or refer to the state of John's own health before proceeding to enquire about the health of the addressee in an attempt to elicit a reply (*Letters* XII, XIV, XVI, XXVI). Our selection includes three letters of congratulation. John congratulated Paeanius and Gemellus on their appointment as prefects of the city of Constantinople (*Letters* IX, XIX) and Anthemius on his praetorian prefecture and ordinary consulate (*Letter* XVIII). Only one of these three letters implicitly requests a reply: it was written to John's friend Paeanius (*Letter* IX), to whom John wrote again complimenting him on his conduct in office as urban prefect, this time reporting on his own health without a request for a letter in return (*Letter* XIII). We have also included John's letter of consolation to Studius on the death of his brother, which begs for a reply (*Letter* X), even though as prefect of the city Studius had persecuted John's followers in Constantinople during the summer of 404.

³ Kelly 1995, 260–63.

⁴ John had already written to Olympias several times between his departure from Constantinople and his arrival in Cucusus, which he announced to her at once (*Letters to Olympias* 1–6).

Apart from Olympias, whose letters to John have not survived,⁵ only one of John's addressees in Constantinople, who included many who had been his friends and supporters before his exile, appears to have written to John: he was Gemellus, who wrote to announce that he was going to be baptized (*Letter XXX*). Two letters in our selection, however, are to a former military commander and a former governor of an eastern province who felt able to communicate freely with John (*Letters XX, XXI*). The letters to the bishops of Carthage, Aquileia and Milan (*Letters XXII–XXIV*) and to three aristocratic ladies in Rome (*Letters XXVII–XXIX*) are of an entirely different tenor: they are pleas for political support. Yet even John's letter to Proba, instead of wishing her good health and prosperity in all her undertakings, asks her to send news about her health (*Letter XXVII*).

Our selection does not attempt to portray John's tribulations in Cucusus or his changing moods in exile, since both these can best be followed in John's letters to Olympias and Malingrey's introduction to and commentary on them. Our purpose is rather to illustrate John's political isolation and the reluctance even of those who had supported him before 20 June 404 to write to him in exile. This stands in sharp contrast to the willingness of many eastern provincials, who were not close to the imperial court and hence not subject to direct political pressure from it, to communicate with John and to show him respect, kindness and even veneration as a holy man. This contrast surely lies behind the posthumous rehabilitation of John's memory, which began in Antioch, where John had lived from birth until he was almost fifty and where he had preached as a priest from 386 to 397. For it was Alexander, the bishop of Antioch, who first restored John's name to the diptychs of his church.⁶

We have arranged our selection in approximate chronological order, accepting the date of each letter proposed by Delmaire in 1991,⁷ with the sole exception of John's letter to Anthemius, whose content seems to us to contradict the date to which Delmaire assigned it (*Letter XVIII* = 147M). In the heading to each letter we state (1) the name of the addressee and, where it is given, his or her title as stated in the manuscripts; (2) the traditional number of the letter in Montfaucon's Benedictine edition and Migne's reprint in the *Patrologia Graeca* (which are identical); and (3) its probable date. We preface the translations with a discussion of the identity and status of John's correspondents in alphabetical order, which gratefully uses Delmaire's

5 John refers to letters that Olympias has sent to him in his *Letter to Olympias* 9.1a.

6 Theodoret, *HE* 5.35.5; cf. Introduction, section 1 at n.25.

7 Delmaire 1991, 176–77.

prosopography of John's letters even where we do not explicitly acknowledge our dependence.⁸ Our notes on individual letters confine themselves in the main to the elucidation of linguistic and philological matters.

Apart from John's letters to Innocentius, the bishop of Rome,⁹ only ten letters have previously been translated into English: they are John's letter to Studius (*Letter X* = 197M) together with another eight letters 'chosen for the breadth of pastoral activity that they record' (*Epp.* 117, 203, 212, 217, 210, 51, 34, 75M),¹⁰ and John's letter to the monk Rufinus (*Ep.* 126M).¹¹

2. RECIPIENTS OF OUR SELECTION OF JOHN'S LETTERS

Aetius (VII = 196M)

John's addressee cannot be identified. John refers to his noble status (εὐγένεια), whatever precisely that may mean (see section 3, below). It may be noted, however, that an Aetius was prefect of the city of Constantinople in 419 and praetorian prefect in 425, while a Flavius Severus Aetius is attested as proconsul of Achaëa in or after 395 and a *comes* Aetius received letters from Isidore of Pelusium.¹²

Anatolius (XII = 205M)

John addressed his letter Ἀνατολίῳ ἐπαρχικῷ: Anatolius was therefore an *officialis* in the service of the praetorian prefect of the East, not a former praetorian prefect, as Otto Seeck supposed.¹³ He was presumably one of the *praefectiani* who escorted John on his journey from Constantinople to Cucusus.¹⁴

Anthemius (XVIII = 147M)

Recent scholarship has universally assumed that Anthemius entered office as praetorian prefect of the East between 11 June and 10 July 405. This

⁸ Delmaire 1991, 103–73.

⁹ Introduction, section 7.4, at n.107.

¹⁰ Mayer and Allen 2000, 197–204.

¹¹ Mayer 2006, 261–63.

¹² *PLRE* 2.19–20, Aetius 1; 30, Aetius 9; 20, Aetius 2, adducing Isidore, *Epp.* 3.141, 159, 328.

¹³ O. Seeck, *RE* 1 (1894), 2072, Anatolius 7; 1906, 69, Anatolius 6.

¹⁴ Delmaire 1991, 108; cf. §§ 114–17.

assumption has seemed to be convincing because it is based on the fact that Anthemius is first attested in office on 10 July 405, while his predecessor Eutychianus appears to be attested as still in office on 11 June 405.¹⁵ Hence a date of August or September 405 has seemed to impose itself for John's letter to Anthemius which congratulates its addressee both on his appointment as prefect and on the ordinary consulate which he assumed on 1 January 405.¹⁶ During the reign of Arcadius, however, appointment as praetorian prefect of the East normally preceded an ordinary consulate. The emperor Arcadius appointed only three other men apart from Anthemius to the praetorian prefecture of the East between the death of his father, Theodosius, and his own death on 1 May 408. They were (1) Caesarius in November 395 and again in 400–403; (2) Eutychianus, apparently briefly in the winter of 396/397, again in late summer 397 and for a third time in 403–404; and (3) Aurelianus in August 399. Each of these men held the ordinary consulate shortly after his appointment as praetorian prefect of the East – Caesarius in 397, Eutychianus in 398 and Aurelianus in 400.¹⁷ Hence it would have been highly anomalous for Anthemius to enter on his ordinary consulate on 1 January 405, more than five months before he was appointed praetorian prefect.

John's congratulation of Anthemius on his ordinary consulate only makes sense either shortly before or shortly after New Year's Day in 405¹⁸ and it is combined with congratulations on Anthemius' appointment as praetorian prefect. Now, while Eutychianus is validly and securely attested as praetorian prefect of the East by subscriptions to laws in the Theodosian Code on 3 February, 14 July and 18 November 404,¹⁹ the only later attestation of him as prefect is a subscription in the Codex Justinianus, which we do not consider reliable.²⁰ Accordingly, since a priori considerations imply

15 *CTh* 7.10.1; cf. *CJ* 5.4.19; see Seeck 1919, 309, 448; *PLRE* 2.93–95, Anthemius 2; Delmaire 1991, 109; Cameron and Long 1993, 158. Earlier, however, Seeck had made the correct inference from this letter, when he argued that Anthemius was appointed praetorian prefect of the East towards the end of 404 and at the same time designated consul for 405 (*O. Seeck, RE* 1 [1894], 2365).

16 Delmaire 1991, 109: 'la lettre de Jean date donc au plus tôt de la fin du mois de juillet 405'.

17 See Cameron and Long 1993, 156–60; Barnes 1995, 93–95, superseding *PLRE* 1.171, Caesarius 6; 1.319–21, Eutychianus 5; 1.128–29, Aurelianus 3. Eutychianus' postulated first brief tenure of the prefecture of the East does not affect the present argument.

18 As Stilling realized (1868, 637).

19 *CTh* 16.8.15; 15.1.42; 16.4.6.

20 *CJ* 5.4.19.

that Anthemius became praetorian prefect of the East before 31 December 404, while John's letter congratulates him on both appointments, we suggest that Anthemius replaced Eutychianus as praetorian prefect of the East in late November or December 404.

Antiochus (VI = 189M)

John's letter to Antiochus belongs to a group of letters addressed to important persons in Constantinople,²¹ and the language that John uses of Antiochus indicates that he was an important person who either held or had held high office or who was in an influential position at the imperial court: the Antiochus to whom John wrote has accordingly been identified as the eunuch and *cubicularius* Antiochus.²² This identification is, however, rendered improbable by the fact that the *Funerary Speech* denounces the eunuch Antiochus both vigorously and anonymously for making war on the Church (§ 122).²³ Moreover, the name Antiochus is far from rare in the fifth century.²⁴

Aurelius (XXII = 149M)

Aurelius had been bishop of Carthage and hence metropolitan bishop of Africa since the 380s.²⁵

Briso (XI = 190M)

The eunuch Briso was a *cubicularius* of the empress Eudoxia, who sent him to persuade John to return to Constantinople after his first brief exile and escort him back to the city (§ 67). John had written to Briso in September announcing his arrival in Cucusus (*Ep.* 234M) and the earlier letter was doubtless taken to Constantinople by one of the *praefectiani* who had escorted John to Cucusus.²⁶ In this letter John reproaches Briso for not replying to his earlier letter, but there is no sign that Briso ever replied to John's later letter either.

²¹ John, *Epp.* 185–99M.

²² *PLRE* 2.101, Antiochus 5; Delmaire 1991, 110.

²³ On whom see *Funerary Speech* n.265, above.

²⁴ *PLRE*, which covers the period 385–527, lists 18 men named Antiochus (2.101–06), including the addressee of this letter (Antiochus 3).

²⁵ *PCBE* 1.105–27, Aurelius 1.

²⁶ Delmaire 1991, 115.

Carterius (III = 236M)

The manuscripts have the heading 'to Carterius the *hegemon*' (Καρτερίῳ ἡγεμόνι). Montfaucon correctly rendered the Greek into Latin as *Carterio praesidi*, since in the Later Roman Empire ἡγεμών was the standard Greek equivalent for the Latin *praeses*.²⁷ Carterius was therefore the *praeses* of Cappadocia Secunda; in a letter to Olympias John records that the governor protected him against monks when he passed through Caesarea on his way to Cucusus.²⁸ This letter supplies the governor's name.

Chromatius (XXIII = 155M)

Chromatius had been bishop of Aquileia for more than a dozen years when John wrote to him, so that he may at that time have been the most senior bishop in North Italy.²⁹

Gemellus (I = 194M; XIX = 124M; XXV = 79M; XXX = 132M)

Gemellus was the son of Anatolius, governor of Phoenicia in 361, and a pupil of Libanius.³⁰ His career is unknown before his appointment as prefect of the city of Constantinople, on which John congratulated him (*Letters* XIX, XXV). However, John's reference to his 'magnificence' (*Letter* I) shows that Gemellus had previously attained high office before he became urban prefect of Constantinople, an office that he held between Optatus, who is last attested on 12 June 405,³¹ and Aemilianus, who became prefect before 19 May 406.³² Gemellus may well have known John as a fellow pupil of Libanius in Antioch in the 360s, and it is possible that his tenure of the urban prefecture was cut short prematurely because he was perceived as too sympathetic to John. (We have included all the known letters of John to Gemellus.)

²⁷ Montfaucon 1721, 730; cf. LSJ 763, s.v. II.c.

²⁸ John, *Letter to Olympias* 9.

²⁹ For what is known about Chromatius, see *PCBE* 2.432–36.

³⁰ Seeck 1906, 66–68, Anatolius 2; 162, Gemellus 1.

³¹ *CTh* 2.33.4.

³² *Chr. Pasch.* 569 Bonn = p. 60 Whitby and Whitby.

Herculius (XVI = 201M)

John's salutation of Herculius as 'my most admirable and magnificent lord' (δέσποτα θαυμασιώτατε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατε) marks him as man of very high status: presumably, therefore, he is identical with the Herculius who was praetorian prefect of Illyricum from 408 to 412, but whose earlier career is unknown.³³

Italica (XXIX = 170M)

Italica was an *illustris femina*,³⁴ that is, the wife of a *vir illustris*, who has been convincingly identified as Probinus, who had been consul in 395 together with his brother Olybrius.³⁵ John addressed his letter not to Italica alone but also to other women in Rome: this is made clear by his use of the second-person plural with plural feminine participles when he refers to 'you ... who choose to do and to suffer anything' (ὁμῖν ... ταῖς πάντα πράξαι καὶ παθεῖν αἰρουμέναις).

Juliana (XXVIII = 169M)

Juliana was the wife of Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius, who had been consul together with his brother Anicius Hermogenianus Probinus in 395 when both were still teenagers.³⁶ Three years after John's death, Jerome composed a panegyric of Demetrias, the daughter of Olybrius and Juliana, who had taken a vow of perpetual virginity,³⁷ in which he calls Olybrius happy in the timing of his premature death because he did not live to see Rome sacked by Alaric in August 410.³⁸ By 'those with her' John must intend the whole of Juliana's household, which suggests that Juliana was head of the household in 406 and hence already a widow.

Leontius (II = 83M)

John refers to Leontius' noble birth (εὐγένεια), but it is not at all clear exactly what he means by this. However, since this letter is transmitted in conjunction with a group of letters sent from Cucusus in which John

33 *PLRE* 2.545, Herculius 2. Delmaire 1991, 132, is more sceptical.

34 Symmachus, *Letter* 9.40; Augustine, *Letter* 161.

35 Delmaire 1991, 136–37; cf. *PLRE* 1.465–66, Italica.

36 On the two brothers, see *PLRE* 1.639–40, Olybrius 2; 1.734–35, Probinus 1.

37 *PLRE* 2.351–52, Demetrias.

38 Jerome, *Ep.* 130.3.

expresses his thanks to the city of Caesarea in Cappadocia for help given to him during his journey into exile (80–84M), Delmaire plausibly infers that Leontius was a notable of that city.³⁹

Marcellinus (V = 188M; XVII = 31M)

John asked Marcellinus to write to him very soon after he had arrived in Cucusus (*Letter V*). But Marcellinus did not reply. John accordingly wrote to him a second time, perhaps in 405 (*Letter XVII*). This later letter states that Marcellinus was of noble status, but it is unclear what precisely this means.⁴⁰ The Marcellinus to whom John wrote these two letters should be carefully distinguished from Marcellinus, the brother of Marcianus, with whom he has sometimes been confused.⁴¹ The brothers Marcianus and Marcellinus were members of the local aristocracy of Antioch: John saluted them as ‘most honourable and most noble’ (κύριοί μου τιμώτατοι καὶ εὐγενέστατοι),⁴² and they were the joint recipients of no fewer than six letters in all from John between autumn 404 and autumn 405.⁴³

Marcianus (XIV = 122M)

Marcianus, whom John describes in a letter to Timothy, a priest in Constantinople, as ‘my lord the most honourable tribune Marcianus’,⁴⁴ was either a *tribunus* in one of the *scholae palatinae* or a *tribunus et notarius* in the service of the imperial court.⁴⁵ John’s letter to Timothy mentions that he has also written to Marcianus, but has not received a reply.

Marinianus (XXVI = 128M)

John was writing from the fortress of Arabissos, from which he also wrote five other letters.⁴⁶ The fact that John sent the priest Euethius, who had

39 Delmaire 1991, 137.

40 Marcellinus was presumably a *vir clarissimus* (PLRE 2.707).

41 See Delmaire 1991, 138–40, commenting on Seeck 1906, 202, Marcellinus 11; 203, Marcianus 14; Ensslin, *RE* 14 (1930), 1513, Marcellinus 22; PLRE 2.707, Marcellinus 1; 714, Marcianus 5.

42 John, *Ep.* 65M.

43 John, *Epp.* 224M, 226M, 19M, 65M, 100M, 129M.

44 John, *Epp.* 211M.

45 Delmaire 1991, 140; cf. PLRE 2.714, Marcianus 6.

46 John, *Epp.* 68M, 70M, 131M, 135M, 143M. Arabissos is about 50 km north-east of Cucusus (*Barrington Atlas*, Map 64 D4).

accompanied him into exile,⁴⁷ to Marinianus with this letter and instructed him to bring back his reply implies that Marinianus was residing not far from John.⁴⁸ Exactly why John refers to Marinianus' noble birth and what he meant by that remains uncertain.⁴⁹

Paeanius (IV = 193M; VIII = 95M; IX = 220M; XIII = 204M)

John wrote all four surviving letters to Paeanius between his arrival in Cucusus and the end of 404, the earliest of them very shortly after his arrival in Cucusus (*Letter IV*).⁵⁰ In *Letters VIII* and *IX* John refers to the persecution of his followers in the weeks following his expulsion from Constantinople (§§ 118–32), and *Letter IX* is firmly dated to the autumn of 404 by comparison with the preceding letter and one of John's letters to Olympias.⁵¹ What then is the honour which brought Paeanius back to Constantinople and on which John congratulates him? John's language fits the prefecture of the city: hence John Martindale deduced that Paeanius preceded Studius as prefect.⁵² The substantive inference is correct, but the date proposed by Martindale is impossible, since John congratulated Paeanius on his appointment after reaching Cucusus, whereas Studius was already prefect when he supervised the inventory of John's church between 20 and 26 June 404.⁵³ Hence, if Paeanius was prefect of the city of Constantinople, it can only have been in succession to Studius, who is last attested in office on 11 September 404.⁵⁴ Delmaire dismissed this possibility on the grounds that Studius' immediate successor must have been Optatus, who had entered office before 21 November 404,⁵⁵ and he suggested instead that Paeanius might have been an *agens in rebus* promoted to be *princeps officii* of the praetorian prefect of the East.⁵⁶ But that relatively humble post could hardly have justified the compliments which John showers on Paeanius. Moreover, the *Funerary Speech* confirms Martindale's conjecture in a passage which was unknown

47 John, *Ep.* 14M = *Letter to Olympias* 9; 114M.

48 Delmaire 1991, 141; cf. 125.

49 See *PLRE* 2.723, Marinianus.

50 Delmaire 1991, 148–49.

51 John, *Letter to Olympias* 9 Malingrey = 14M.

52 *PLRE* 2.818, Paianius; 1255 (list of prefects of Constantinople). W. Ensslin, *RE* 18.2 (1943), 2375, Paianios 3, had already drawn the correct inference that John addressed this letter to Paeanius as city prefect of Constantinople.

53 Palladius, *Dial.* 3.92.

54 *CTh* 16.4.5.

55 *CTh* 12.1.160.

56 Delmaire 1991, 150–51.

to Delmaire. The speech complains that the eunuch Antiochus 'removed from office the previous prefect <of the city>, who had been restraining most of their mad actions by the mildness of his character, and installed another who had long desired the blood of Christians' (§ 123). The latter prefect is clearly Optatus, but the prefect whom he replaced cannot be Studius, who was equally hostile to John. Hence the prefect who was dismissed because he attempted to restrain John's enemies must be Paeanius.

The contents of *Letter XIII* indicate that the bishop Theodore, who was the cousin of Paeanius and whom John wished to regulate the affairs of the churches in Cilicia, especially the church of Castabala, can hardly be anyone other than Theodore of Mopsuestia.⁵⁷ But Mopsuestia was not the metropolitan see of Cilicia II: that was Anazarbus, whose bishop at this date appears to be unknown.

Palladius (XV = 113M)

Palladius is the bishop of Helenopolis and author of the *Historical Dialogue* defending John.⁵⁸ As an avowed supporter of John, he was forced to leave Constantinople early in 405: he fled to Rome, where he was welcomed and given lodging by the Roman aristocrat Pinianus.⁵⁹

Proba (XXVII = 168M)

Anicia Faltonia Proba was the widow of the powerful Sextus Claudius Petronius Probus, who had held several praetorian prefectures under Valentinian and Gratian and an ordinary consulate in 371 and who was the father of Olybrius and Probinus, the youthful consuls of 395. At the same time as John wrote to Proba, he also wrote to her two noble daughters-in-law, Juliana and Italica. The three letters, which are to be read together, carefully balance thanks for the recipients' efforts on John's behalf and pleas for them to continue to support his cause.

⁵⁷ Delmaire 1991, 148, 149.

⁵⁸ See Introduction, section 7.6.

⁵⁹ Palladius, *Lausiaca History* 61.7. We translate below three letters of John to prominent aristocratic ladies in Rome (*Letters XXVII–XXIX*).

Studius (X = 197M)

Studius, who had been *comes rei privatae* in 401,⁶⁰ is attested in the Theodosian Code as prefect of the city of Constantinople on 29 August and 11 September 404.⁶¹ He had, however, entered office before John departed into exile on 20 June, since he supervised the inventory of the property of John's church, which preceded the consecration of Arsacius as bishop on 26 June.⁶²

Theodosius (XX = 58M)

The heading to John's letter styles Theodosius ἀπὸ δουκῶν, which should designate a former military *dux* of a province rather than being an honorary title bestowed on a retired court official.⁶³ The warm and friendly tone of John's letter suggests that Theodosius may be the unnamed nephew of Pergamius, the bishop of Nicaea, who as *dux* of Armenia expressed pleasure when he welcomed the exiled John in 404.⁶⁴

Theodotus (XXI = 61M)

The heading to John's letter styles Theodotus ἀπὸ κονσουλαιρίων, which indicates either that Theodotus had governed one of the 15 provinces in the Eastern Roman Empire governed by *consulares* in the early fifth century or that he had been given the honorary rank of *consularis* on his retirement from imperial service.⁶⁵

Venerius (XXIV = 182M)

Venerius was bishop of Milan from 400 or 401 to 409: he succeeded Simplicius, the immediate successor of Ambrose, who died in 397.⁶⁶

60 *CTh* 9.42.17 = 10.10.23 (19 January 401).

61 *CTh* 16.2.37, 4.5.

62 Palladius, *Dial.* 3.92; cf. Delmaire 1991, 159–60.

63 *PLRE* 2.1100, Theodosius 4.

64 John, *Letter to Olympias* 4; cf. Delmaire 1991, 164.

65 *PLRE* 2.1103, Theodotus 2; Delmaire 1991, 164–65.

66 Cazzani 1996, 24–25.

3. NOTES ON TERMS DENOTING STATUS

John employs a variety of honorific titles and salutations for the recipients of his letters that reflect their official status or social rank (sometimes both). We list below the Greek honorific adjectives and abstract nouns which John uses in our selection of his letters, give the English translation that we normally use, and summarize the concordant and overlapping conclusions of three helpful modern studies of the use of such titles. In 1929 Sister Lucilla Dinneen collected and analysed the titles of address in Christian writers down to the accession of Justinian, and twenty years later Henrik Zilliacus published a general study of forms of address and honorific titles in Greek down to Byzantine times that devoted its longest chapter to Greek ecclesiastical epistolography, especially of the fourth century. In addition, in 1991, Roland Delmaire's long study of the chronology and prosopography of John's letters collected and analysed the honorific titles and salutations used by John as the basis for his prosopography, both in order to define, wherever possible, the status of those to whom John wrote and to distinguish between different addressees bearing the same name.⁶⁷

διάθεσις = disposition

ἐμμέλεια = gracious self (literally, grace)

Since both these abstract nouns, which designate qualities or attributes rather than titles of rank, are applied to all classes of persons, their use in itself permits no inference about the status of the recipient of a letter.

εὐγένεια = nobility

First attested in papyri of the early fourth century for a camp commander (*praefectus castrorum*) and used very frequently by the Cappadocian Fathers (Basil of Caesarea and the two Gregories) and especially John, this abstract noun is applied almost exclusively to laymen and lay women. Although etymologically εὐγένεια implies high social rank, John sometimes adopts a rather broad definition of 'nobility'; he applies the term not only to the noblest aristocrats in Rome (*Letters* XXVII–XXIX), but also to those far lower down the social scale, such as the provincial notables Leontius (*Letter* II) and Euethius (*Ep.* 173M).⁶⁸

67 Delmaire 1991, 91–97. For the titles and abstract nouns discussed here, see also Dinneen 1929, 43–44, 48–49, 63–65; Zilliacus 1949, 45, 47, 67–69.

68 Euethius helped John on his journey into exile: he therefore lived in Cappadocia or Galatia (Delmaire 1991, 125). The noun εὐγένεια occurs more than 300 times in the Johannean corpus.

θαυμασιότης = admirable self, excellency

We have adopted Dinneen's English versions of this abstract title, which is very frequently used to address laymen of high rank by John, Firmus of Caesarea in Cappadocia and Theodoret. Everyone for whom John uses the abstract term is someone who either was currently holding or had recently held a high official post.

θαυμασιώτατος = most admirable

Dinneen found that the epithet θαυμασιώτατος is frequent both in papyri and 'in all the most important authors of the fifth and sixth centuries except Gregory of Nyssa and Nilus' of Ancyra.⁶⁹ Like the abstract noun θαυμασιότης, its use is restricted to imperial dignitaries of high rank.

θαυμασιώτατος καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατος = most admirable and most magnificent

John uses this combination of honorific epithets only of consuls and holders of high administrative office such as praetorian prefects and prefects of the city of Constantinople.

κοσμιότης = propriety

Like the corresponding superlative epithet κοσμιώτατος, the abstract noun κοσμιότης is used by John only when addressing women.

μεγαλοπρέπεια = magnificence

μεγαλοπρεπέστατος = most magnificent

Both terms are used of laymen of high rank.

τιμιότης = honour

τιμιώτατος = most honourable

The abstract noun τιμιότης had been a favourite of Basil of Caesarea, who used it of laymen of distinction, but it had practically lost any real meaning by the early fifth century; John uses it for 'persons of every class', but especially for bishops, priests and even deaconesses, and its application to lay persons indicates nothing whatever in itself about their rank or social status.⁷⁰ The epithet τιμιώτατος had a similarly wide application.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Dinneen 1929, 44–45.

⁷⁰ Dinneen 1929, 71–73; Zilliacus 1949, 47, 75–76, 77.

⁷¹ Dinneen 1929, 71–73; Delmaire 1991, 96–97.

TRANSLATION OF THIRTY SELECTED LETTERS OF JOHN

I To Gemellus (194M)

early September 404

I am living in Cucusus, a desolate place, indeed the most desolate in the whole of our world. But even if I have been taken away to the very ends of the inhabited world, I cannot forget your love <for me>.⁷² Though dwelling in a foreign and desolate land, still carrying the remnants of illness, and beset by fear of brigands (for the Isaurians do not cease barricading the roads and filling everything with bloodshed), I incessantly carry you around in my mind, attempting to produce in myself your courage, your confidence, your sweet and genuine disposition and luxuriating in the memory of these thoughts. <Please> write to me at once, <my> most admirable lord, about your state of health, about how the hot baths have helped you, and where your affairs stand now, so that, although distant, I may be at no disadvantage compared with those who are in constant contact with you as regards a clear knowledge of your affairs. For you know that it is of the highest importance to me to learn about your physical well-being, because I love you greatly, and am utterly bound to your magnificence.

II To Leontius (83M)

early September 404

I have been exiled from your city, but I am not exiled from your love. For, while to remain there or be expelled lay in the power of others, the other <lies> within our power. Hence no-one will be able to deprive me of it: but wherever I may be absent <from you>, I carry everywhere the honey of your love and luxuriate in the memory of your nobility, putting together your love for me, your eagerness, your wisdom, your kindly disposition, your hospitality, and everything else and attempting to form <within myself> the image of your excellent qualities. Therefore, since you chose me and have so bound me by affection that I greatly desire your presence, though this cannot be realized at present, <please> provide me the comfort that comes

⁷² We have sometimes translated the Greek noun ἀγάπη as ‘love,’ sometimes as ‘affection’ according to which seems the more appropriate in context.

from letters. For you will be able to calculate from the frequency of my letters the pleasure <that I would derive> from being in your presence, since you are endowed with such great understanding.

III To the governor Carterius (236M) early September 404

Cucusus is an exceedingly desolate place.⁷³ However, it does not so much distress me by its remoteness as give me pleasure by its tranquillity and by not presenting me with problems from any quarter. Hence, having arrived in this desolate spot as if it were a <safe> harbour, I reside <here> breathing again after the evils of the journey and using the tranquillity here to cure the remnants of my illness and of the other evils that I have endured. I have said this to your eminence,⁷⁴ since I know well that you greatly rejoice in my recovery and because I cannot ever forget what you did there, quelling those reckless and senseless disturbances and doing everything to secure my safety and fulfilling your duty.

I shall proclaim this to everyone wherever I may go, since I owe you a great debt of gratitude for this protection, my most excellent lord. But please grant me the favour of deriving great pleasure not only from being your friend, but also from having the benefit of a letter from you reporting on your health. For I shall receive no ordinary consolation even while a sojourner in a strange land, if I were to receive such a letter from your excellency.

IV To Paeanius (193M) early September 404

You have given me wings and made me dance with joy! For when you reported painful news, you added a remark that ought to serve as a verdict on all that happens. You said: 'Glory to God for everything!' This remark <dealt> a mortal wound to the Devil, <and it provides> the one who says it with the greatest guarantee of safety and pleasure in the face of every danger. For as soon as someone has given voice to it, the cloud of despondency is at once dissipated. So do not stop saying this and teaching others <to say it>. In this way the storm which has attacked us, even if it becomes still more severe, will change to calm; in this way those who are storm-tossed will enjoy a great reward as well as release from their hardships. This crowned

⁷³ John used the adverbial phrase μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς, which we leave untranslated, 173 times out of 243 in the whole of the *TLG* canon.

⁷⁴ John here uses the abstract noun λαμπρότης, which accurately reflects Carterius' status as a *vir clarissimus*, but we have preferred the more exalted 'eminence' to 'clarissimate' on grounds of elegance. Significantly, John goes on to address Carterius with terms which he normally uses of officials of much higher status than lowly *praesides*.

Job <in triumph>, this remark routed the Devil, made him hide himself and retreat, this brings removal of all disturbance. Continue then chanting this prayer <as an antidote> to everything that happens!

As for my location, let no-one be concerned in future. For even if Cucusus is a desolate place, I am nevertheless enjoying tranquillity here, and I have managed to recover from the extraordinary weakness that I suffered as a result of the journey, by resting continuously at home. If you are going to compel me again to move from place to place, I shall suffer the greatest distress, especially since winter is at the door.

Let no-one criticize anyone else or be tiresome on this account. But please write to me at once about your health, your activities <in Constantinople>, your high reputation and your good humour. For I shall enjoy unusual comfort, even though residing in such a desolate place, if I receive such a letter from your honour.

V To Marcellinus (188M)

September 404

I have been taken away to the most desolate of all places, Cucusus. But I enjoy great consolation whenever I call to mind the affection of you who love me, feeling rich in my isolation. For it is no ordinary treasure to encounter men who know how to love truly. For this reason, even though I am not physically present in body, I am bound to you in soul, being shackled by the bonds of love. Accordingly, I am writing from such a great distance and I give you the greeting you deserve. For you are not unaware, my most excellent lord, that I have enrolled you in the first rank of my admirers. Please then return me the favour and write to me directly with good news about your health, so that by both writing and receiving such letters I may reap great solace and joy and derive very great consolation even though residing in such a desolate place.

VI To Antiochus (189M)

September 404

For⁷⁵ when can I ever forget your sweet and warm disposition, your genuine and sincere love, your free and lofty mind, your courageous soul? For even though I have departed to the ends of the inhabited world, I departed carrying you, my fervent admirer, with me everywhere, you who are so closely bound to me by the law of affection. Hence, even though I have been transported to the most desolate place in our inhabited world (I mean,

75 Since the text of the letter begins with the words *πότε γάρ*, its original opening sentence may have been lost (cf. Denniston 1954, 56–98).

to Cucusus) and cannot easily find anyone to carry letters <for me>, I have exerted great efforts to seek out and find the man who bears this epistle of mine so that I may address your excellency and deliver the greeting that your magnificence deserves. Because of what you have already done, I do not think that I need to be in any doubt that you will need no reminder from me to write to me directly and give me glad tidings about your health. For I shall reap no ordinary comfort when I receive from you who love me greatly a letter which informs <me> about your bodily health, at once renews your love through letters and makes <me> imagine that your love is here with me. For frequent letters which are brought from genuine friends suffice to conjure up the pleasure of their actual presence.

VII To Aetius (196M)

September 404

I can never forget your love <for me, which is> warm, true and tested by fire, sincere and without guile. On the contrary, I constantly carry you around in my mind and have you engraved in my consciousness. I also wished to see you directly, but since it is impossible for the time being, I satisfy my desire through this letter of mine, paying the respect that is due to your piety, and I beseech you in your turn to write to me directly. For, even though I reside in extreme isolation, I am beset by fear of brigands and happen to be in ill-health,⁷⁶ nevertheless, if I receive a letter from your nobility bringing glad tidings about your health, I shall reap great comfort even in an alien land. Knowing then how much favour you will show me and how great the gladness you will cause me, please do not begrudge me this pleasure, but hasten to send me a letter quite soon, since I shall reap great pleasure from that.

VIII To Paeanius (95M)

late September/early October 404

What has happened is harsh, but it is necessary to mourn, not for those who have suffered and nobly stood their ground, but for those who did <these things>. For just as those wild animals that are hard to kill fling themselves in great fury against the tips of spears and drive the swords deep into their innards, so those who recklessly perpetrate these illegal acts bring the cruel fire of hell on their own heads. If they pride themselves on what they are doing, they are for this reason especially to be pitied and deserve even more tears, because in this way they are preparing harsher reckonings

⁷⁶ Illness and the physical dangers posed by Isaurian brigands are constant themes of John's letters from exile, especially those to Olympias (Neureiter 2010).

for themselves. Hence one must incessantly mourn for them, but rejoice with those who are being so cruelly butchered by them because of their rewards, the crowns <of martyrdom> laid aside for them in heaven, and one must consider that this is the greatest and clearest proof of the deadly wound <inflicted> on the Devil. For if the wound he received had not been deadly, he would not have breathed so strongly through those who obey him.

Bearing all this in mind, my most admirable lord, please receive great comfort, and write to me continually about your health. For we desire to see and embrace your head which is dear to me, but since this is impossible at present, I request your nobility both to write to me yourself directly <with news> about your bodily health and to make those who greatly love me extremely content in this regard.

IX To Paeanius (220M)

October 404

I have revived, I have jumped for joy, I no longer think of myself as living in an alien or foreign city, now that your excellency has returned to the city that has suffered such things. What gives me so much pleasure is not the fact that you have gained the enjoyment of a greater honour, for your honour is the virtue of your soul, and no-one was able to rob you of it in the past, nor has anyone now restored it, for how could anyone restore what had not been taken away? I rejoice that you have entered that city as a great solace to those who are being persecuted, butchered and imprisoned, having become a universal benefactor and a broad haven for them. For you know how to secure the benefits that ought to be secured. Please write about the extent of your virtuous acts, and tell me clearly how many stricken you have raised up, how many fallen you have lifted up, whom you have rescued from shipwreck, whom you have stood by after they have suffered in this long period, whom you have made eager instead of dispirited and whom among the eager you have made even more eager – in brief all the deeds of valour in every category in this struggle of yours <against evil>.⁷⁷ For I know it even before <receiving> a letter from you, since I know your soul, the noble athlete and the admirable warrior. Nevertheless, I wish to learn of these things from your own mouth, which is most dear to me. Please grant me this request, since you know what sort of gratitude you will earn by doing this.

⁷⁷ We have supplied the phrase '<against evil>' because this is the sense in which John normally uses the noun παράταξις, which occurs 262 times in the Johannine corpus.

X To Studius (197M)⁷⁸ between September and December 404⁷⁹

I know, because you are intelligent and skilled in philosophy, that even before my letter you will have borne calmly the departure of the blessed brother of your magnificence. For I would not call it death. But since it is necessary that I too contribute what I can, I request your excellency, most magnificent sir, to show yourself <as you really are> on this occasion too, not so that you do not feel distress (for this is impossible since you are human and entwined with flesh and miss such a brother), but so that you set a limit on your grief. For you know the perishable nature of human affairs, that events replicate the nature of currents in rivers, and that we must consider blessed only those who end the present life with firm hope. For they do not proceed towards death, but from contests to prizes, from wrestling bouts to victors' crowns, from the troubled sea to a tranquil haven.

Bearing this in mind, console yourself, since I too, though unusually distressed, have this very great comfort for my distress – the virtue of the man, which I believe brings very great consolation to you yourself too. For, if the departed had been a wicked person full of evil, I would have needed to wail and lament for that reason; but since he was such <as he was> and lived his life, as the whole city knows, with propriety and goodness, always honouring justice, using the appropriate freedom of speech and action, <showing> bravery, placing no value on the present but a stranger to the cares of this life, I have reason to rejoice and congratulate both him and your excellency for sending ahead such a brother, who from now onwards will keep what he possessed when he departed in an inviolate treasure chest.

Do not therefore, my most admirable lord, entertain thoughts unworthy of yourself, even though you are shattered by sorrow, but display at the present time what you really are, and be so kind as to indicate to me that you have gained some benefit from my letter, so that I too, though residing at such a distance, may pride myself on having been able to prune much of this despondency by a mere letter.

XI To Briso (190M) autumn 404

What's this? When I was in Constantinople,⁸⁰ you were eager to do and say countless things, and you made yourself conspicuous to the whole city, or

⁷⁸ Also translated by Mayer and Allen 2000, 199–200.

⁷⁹ So Delmaire 1991, 160. But in his chronological table Delmaire has merely 'avant décembre' 404' (179).

⁸⁰ Literally, 'there' (αὐτόθι).

rather to the <whole> world, in the matter of the love which you showed me, not bearing to keep it silent, but showing it everywhere through your actions and words; but you have not once deigned to write to me, and this though I have a deep thirst for letters from you and long for you to write <even a single> missive.

Do you not know much comfort I expected to harvest from so genuine a soul by receiving a letter as the fruit of so warm a friendship? I do not say this in reproof (since I know that, whether you write or keep silence, you maintain your <benevolent> disposition towards me at its peak), but out of an intense desire for letters from you. Since you do not write, I do not cease asking those who arrive from where you are about your health and well-being, and I rejoice greatly when I hear what I desire <to hear>. But I want to learn these things from your tongue and from your right hand. So, if I am not making a burdensome or tiresome request, please now at least grant me this greatest and most pleasant boon, which will bring me much pleasure.

XII To Anatolius the *praefectianus* (205M) second half of November 404

I am writing to your nobility late and briefly, or rather slowly. Yet the cause of my silence is not laziness, but a long bout of illness. I am permanently bound to you by love, knowing the genuineness of your love <for me>, the generosity, honesty and integrity of your mind. I have not ceased to proclaim to everyone the good will which I have consistently enjoyed from your nobility not only when I was with you, but also in my absence. For it has not escaped my notice how much you have endeavoured to say and to do on my behalf since my exile. May God reward you for your support both here and now and in the life to come! But so that I may enjoy greater pleasure from not only writing, but also receiving letters from your gracious self, be so kind as to write to me with good news about your health, so that even while residing in this desolate place I may reap great comfort. For if I receive a letter from your loving person with good tidings for me about your well-being and that of all those close to you, I shall receive great comfort, even though sojourning in an alien land.

XIII To Paeanius (204M)

end of November 404

Whenever you reflect, my most admirable lord who are to me sweeter than honey, that our being separated is a heavy burden, please leap for joy and exult when you consider how important a task you are taking in hand and that you govern a whole city, or rather the whole world through that city. For together with the help <that you give to others> it is possible for you

to derive great pleasure as well. For if some are transported with such great joy as they pile up the wealth that both perishes and destroys them, only to be separated for a long time from their homes, wives, children and all their relatives, what calculation could compare the pleasure of <worldly> riches and the great treasure that you amass every day merely by showing yourself there?⁸¹ I do not say this to flatter you (and they know it well who hear this from me here in your absence), but with much pleasure, happy and elated by joy. For you are able, merely by appearing, to restore, to raise up, to encourage and to bring together many of the people there. I know my champion, I know your deeds of valour there, your zeal, your sleepless devotion, your courses, the labour of your soul, the freedom of expression and action with which you have resisted even bishops as the present situation requires, though with appropriate moderation. I used to admire you for those actions, but <I admire you> all the more now, since, with no-one there at your side, but with some in exile, some persecuted and some in hiding, you alone have stood in the battle-line, adorning its front and allowing no-one to become a deserter, but by your diligence bringing over every day those drawn up with our enemies.

I do not admire you only for this, but because, though stationed in a single place, you take care of the whole inhabited world – affairs in Palestine, in Phoenicia and in Cilicia (over which you have an especial obligation to concern yourself).⁸² The Palestinians and Phoenicians, as I know well, have not accepted the <bishop> sent there by our enemies nor deemed him worthy of an answer. The <people> of Aegae, as I know, and of Tarsus are ranged with them, and the <people> of Castabala here have made it clear to one of my friends that those from Constantinople are trying to force them to agree with their lawlessness, though they are holding out at present. You need, therefore, great care and sleepless devotion to set right this part <of the world> too by writing to my lord your cousin bishop Theodore.

The affair of Pharetrius is vexing and extremely tiresome, but, since his priests neither met those of our opponents, as you report, nor choose to communicate with them, but claim still to stand with us, please do not communicate at all with them, since what Pharetrius has done to me is unforgivable.⁸³ Yet all his clergy grieved, wept and lamented, and were

81 Sc. in Constantinople.

82 Paeanius' obligation arose from fact that he was a cousin of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

83 Pharetrius was the bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia; he declared his support for John's enemies after John's return to Constantinople after his first exile (*Palladius, Dial.* 9.47–52); during the summer of 404 he caused considerable trouble for John when he passed through

completely on my side in their views. However, so that we do not alienate them or render them more intractable, please keep to yourself what you discover from the inhabitants of the province, and conduct yourself towards them with great mildness (I know your skill in management) and say: 'We too have heard that <the clergy> were gravely upset by what happened and that they were ready to suffer anything in order to set right all <Pharetrius> evil and reckless deeds.'

My body is in good health and I have cast off the remains of my illness. When I reflect that this too is of concern to you, the fact that I have so zealous a lover becomes no small reason for my good health. Let God give you a reward for such support, love, zeal, sleepless devotion, both in this life and in the life to come, and may he fortify, guard and keep you safe, and deem you worthy of those unutterable blessings. And may he also grant me soon to see your beloved face, to enjoy your sweet soul and to celebrate this the fairest of feasts. For you know that it is a feast and a festival for me to receive the gift of your company, which is most pleasant and full of blessings, and to enjoy this once again.

XIV To Marcianus (122M)

beginning of winter 404/405

You are blessed, thrice blessed and many times this, because you display such greatness of soul towards the needy in such a harsh winter and so great a turbulence of affairs. The great extent of your generosity has not escaped my notice, nor that you have become a new haven for all by supporting orphans, offering every consolation to widows and relieving their poverty, raising up beggars and allowing them not even to be aware of their indigence, but being everything for them, and supplying the whole people with grain, wine, olive oil and everything else.⁸⁴ Let God give you in return both in the present life and in the age to come the appropriate reward for this greatness of soul, munificence, eagerness, zeal, love of beggars and true love. For you are brimming with all these and display them in abundance, laying up for yourself great prizes in the age to come.

Learning all this while living in this desolate place and surrounded by many perils – for I am distressed by the oppression of being in fear of the

Caesarea en route to Cucusus (*Letter to Olympias* 9; cf. Kelly 1995, 241, 256–57). Immediately after his arrival in Cucusus John had written to the governor Carterius to thank him for ensuring his safety (*Letter III*).

84 John alludes to the generosity of Marcianus, who was a *tribunus*, in giving material support to the exiled bishop's poor followers in Constantinople who, as schismatics, were now both persecuted and deprived of imperial subsidies (Delmaire 1991, 140–41).

Isaurians, by the desolateness of the place and the severity of winter – nevertheless, when I hear these things about your excellency, I cease to be aware of these afflictions, but derive great solace, jumping for joy, exultant and elated at such virtuous actions and at the unutterable wealth that you are collecting for yourself in heaven. Therefore, so that I may rejoice over another matter as well, please do not hesitate to write to me at once with glad tidings about your health, for I greatly desire to hear news of your bodily health. You yourself know this, since you know how I always cherish your love.

XV To Palladius the bishop (113M) end of 404

As regards my own private affairs I have no need of consolation, since the current situation provides me with sufficient solace. But I lament the storm <that has engulfed> all the churches and the shipwreck that has overwhelmed the whole world, and I urge all of you to assist with prayers, so that this universal catastrophe may at some time come to an end and everything revert to unruffled calm. Please do not cease doing this.

By hiding yourself and escaping notice, you now have greater leisure for persevering in prayer, even if your mind is oppressed. It is no small thing to prostrate oneself before God, who loves mankind. Please therefore do not cease doing this, and write to me as soon as it is possible (whenever that is). For, even if I am separated from your gracious self by a long distance, I do not cease to concern myself with your affairs every day, asking and persistently questioning those who arrive from where you are, though we do not often meet them. Accordingly, so that I may have a clearer knowledge of everything, please do me the favour, whenever there is an opportunity, of giving me glad tidings of your health so that I may reap great comfort, even though residing in an isolated place.

XVI To Herculius (201M)⁸⁵ late 404 or 405?

Do not trouble yourself to search for an excuse for your long silence, my most admirable and magnificent lord, or to take refuge in the lack of letter-carriers. For, whether you write or are silent, I keep unshaken my confidence in your love, which you have shown so clearly by your actions that the whole city knows that you are my warm and devoted admirer. However, situated as I am, I greatly desire to receive an immediate letter from your excellency reporting on your health. For, just as you used to say yourself that to learn about my health was the greatest consolation for separation (and you know

85 Misnumbered 'CC' by Montfaucon in his Latin translation (1721, 712).

what this meant to a man who understands friendship, since you know how to be a good friend), so this is something I greatly long for. Please then grant me this favour, so that, though living here in this desolate place, I may reap great comfort from it.

XVII To Marcellinus (31M)

405

We have both maintained a long silence towards each other. Yet I have not forgotten that longstanding and true love of yours for me: I preserve it alive and well and, wherever I may be away from you, I carry it around with me, deriving the greatest comfort from it. For this reason, now that I have come across some who are going to meet your nobility, I have given them the greeting that I owe you, and report that, even though I was transported to the ends of the inhabited world, I kept you in my mind <and> engraved on my consciousness during my departure. However, since not only writing but receiving letters from those who are so loved brings great pleasure to those in such a situation, please double my pleasure, my most honoured lord, and write to me at once, whenever it is possible, with news about your health. For you know my eagerness to learn about this and how much comfort I shall derive from it, while residing in an alien land.

XVIII To Anthemius (147M)

early 405

Others may felicitate your excellency on both your consulate and your prefecture, but I <felicitate> the official posts because of your magnificence, since they have not bestowed splendour on you, but have acquired splendour from you. For such is human excellence: it does not borrow honours from outside <a man>, but itself carries them about in itself, bestowing honour on these <official> ranks, rather than receiving it from them. For this reason I have not now added to my love for you. For you have had nothing added to you: we do not love the prefect and consul, but my most gentle lord Anthemius, who is brimful of much wisdom and much philosophy. I also therefore count you blessed, not because you have mounted this throne <of office>, but because you have received a richer opportunity to display your wisdom and your love of humanity. And I congratulate all those who suffer wrong, seeing the wide haven of your soul, which can save countless shipwrecks and make the victims of the most dire storms sail in fair weather. For this I dance with joy, for this I rejoice, considering your appointment to be a universal festival for all the afflicted – <a festival> which I too am now enjoying, since I count the greatness of your successes as a pleasure for myself.

XIX To Gemellus (124M)

summer 405, after mid-July

Others <may> felicitate your excellency on your office. I, however, felicitate the city and your magnificence, not because of your honour there (for you have learnt to be above such things), but because you have received an opportunity that permits you with great impunity to display to the populace both your wisdom and your mildness and to gain profit therefrom. For I know well that you will be able to teach those who are excessively attached to the earth and gape in wonder at these empty visions (I mean popular glory) that <the power of> the magistrate does not lie in his cloak and belt or in the loud voice of the herald, but in the fruits of his labours – to correct what is wrong, to punish injustice and not to allow justice to be defeated by the influence of the powerful. I know your boldness of speech, your outspokenness, the profundity of your intellect, your contempt for the mundane necessities of life, your hatred of evil, your mildness, your love of your fellow human beings, a quality which a magistrate needs especially. For this reason I know that you will be a haven for the shipwrecked, a staff of support for those on bended knee, a tower of strength for those who are being attacked by unjust persons in power. You do not need effort, sweat or a long time to set these things to right. But, just as the sun dissipates the darkness as soon as it appears, so too, as soon as you appeared on your throne <of office>, I know well that from the break of day you drove off those who were attempting to do wrong and rescued from ill treatment those who were being wronged even before they came into court: simply the reputation of your philosophic soul sufficed to correct this. For this reason, although I am in a desolate place and constrained by many trials, I feel full of good cheer since I consider it my pleasure to be ranged alongside those who are wronged.

XX To the former *dux* Theodosius (58M)

405 or 406

You have flavoured your letter with much honey, or rather you have made it sweeter than honey. For when honey is savoured by those who delight in its sweetness more frequently, it does not still seem equally pleasant, since satiety destroys the mastery of the pleasure. But your letters, which bring me glad tidings of your health, are not at all subject to this, because they actually intensify my joy precisely when they are sent more frequently. You have embraced my letter, while I have not only embraced you, the father of the letter, but have also flung both my arms around you and have reaped much consolation from throwing myself on your neck and kissing your head so dear to me. For I did not think that your letter alone had arrived, but

that you yourself were present with me and giving me your company. Such was the power of your letter. For such is the nature of genuine love: even if its streams flow through letters, it enables one to imagine the source of the letters – which is what has happened to me. Neither length of time nor distance of the journey nor the state of affairs nor anything else has hindered me in this. Knowing this, therefore, my most admirable lord, please do not hesitate to write to me immediately with news about your health, your whole household and your good spirits. For you know how eager I am to learn <about them>.

XXI To Theodotus, former *consularis* (61M)⁸⁶

early 406

It is a <mark of a true> father not only not to be angry that your son is embracing true philosophy, but even to rejoice with him and to do everything that he may achieve perfection in it, and not to be distressed that he is far from his homeland, his home and your eyes, but rather to think of him as near, when he improves in virtue. For this reason I both acknowledge a great debt of gratitude to you, and am surprised that, having given me such a gift as your son, you have decided that you need to give presents to honour me. I appreciate the honour conveyed by what has been sent, but I am sending the gifts back to you, not because I lack respect for your nobility (for how could I <fail to respect> one who loves me so much?), but because I consider it excessive to seek enjoyment from things of which I stand in no need.

As for the fine <young man> Theodotus the lector,⁸⁷ I wanted to keep him with me and mould him, but, since everywhere here is full of murder, disorder, bloodshed and arson because the Isaurians are destroying everything with sword and fire, while I am being moved from place to place, changing location every day, I have decided that it is necessary to send him away, with lengthy instructions to my lord the most pious deacon Theodotus⁸⁸ to take continuous charge and the greatest care of him. Please see to it yourself too that this is put in place for your son, and you will certainly praise my counsel and be extremely grateful to me for this advice.⁸⁹

86 Delmaire 1991, 164, infers that at the time when John wrote to him Theodotus was living either in Syria or in another province closer to Cucusus.

87 Children of devout parents were often made lectors in adolescence or even in childhood (Gaudemet 1958, 105–06).

88 This Theodotus was a deacon in Antioch (Delmaire 1991, 165–66).

89 John subsequently thanked Theodotus for giving his son a warm welcome (*Ep.* 141M).

XXII To Aurelius, bishop of Carthage (149M) spring 406

Bless me!⁹⁰ what a thing is a noble soul that teems with much fruit both of love and of piety, since you have chosen me and lifted me up as if you were present and with me, although you reside at such a long distance⁹¹ from me. For the warmth of your love and the fragrance of your boldness of speech and your piety have reached me, even though I reside at the ends of the inhabited world. For this I am immensely grateful to you, for this I bless your piety, because you have undertaken much labour and toil on behalf of the churches throughout the world and have earned for yourself the greatest crowns <of glory> before God, who loves mankind. We urge you to continue waging this great contest, since you know the prizes of victory there. For if someone who gives support to a single individual who is suffering wrong and injustice has an unutterable reward from God, consider how great is the recompense that you yourself will receive for rescuing by this fine effort of yours so many troubled churches from disturbances and disorder, and for having exerted yourself to guide them into the anchorage of a calm and peaceful haven.

XXIII To Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia (155M) spring 406

The clarion of your warm and genuine love has resounded even as far as I am, sending a great and piercing sound from so great a distance, and reaching to the very ends of the earth. I who am lodged at such a long journey <from you> know just as well as those who are present <with you> your most eager and fiery love, your honest utterances that are filled with great freedom and boldness of speech, your constancy that resembles <the hardness of> steel. For this reason I eagerly desire to meet you face to face. However, since this is prevented by the desolate place where I am imprisoned, having found my most honourable lord and most devout priest, I fulfil my longing, as far as is possible, by writing to you and addressing you, expressing my great gratitude to you for the support which you have given me with such persistency throughout all this long time. I beseech you, when you return, or even apart from this, to write to me about your health through the couriers at your disposal, if any can be found who are coming to this desolate place. For you know how much pleasure I shall derive from receiving more frequently good news of the health of those who are so warmly disposed towards me.

90 John was very fond of the interjection βαβαί: according to the *TLG* 136 occurrences of the word can be found in John out of a total of 505 for the whole of Greek literature.

91 Literally, 'length of journey' (ὁδοῦ μήκος).

XXIV To Venerius, bishop of Milan (182M)

spring 406

Even before <this> everyone knew your courage, your boldness of speech, your willingness to speak out on behalf of the truth; <but> the present occasion has shown more precisely your brotherly affection, your love, your piety, your great sympathy, your concern on behalf of the churches. For, as a storm at sea most marks out a helmsman and serious bodily illnesses an outstanding doctor, so the present evil situation marks out the one who exerts himself to live a life of piety and possesses great courage. This has happened in your case, and so far as concerns you, everything has been done correctly and nothing has been left undone. But since those who caused and are causing disturbances have gone so far in the madness as not only not to conceal their earlier <misdeeds>, but to base their further actions on them, I urge all of you together to exercise your most determined zeal and not to let your eagerness slacken, but to redouble your efforts, even if countless hindrances block your way. For those who achieve some great and noble actions through more toils and labours will receive a greater reward than those who achieve this aim easily and with facility. For each, as the blessed Paul says, will receive his own reward according to his labours (1 Corinthians 3.8). Do not therefore allow the fact that you have toiled greatly make you renounce <the task>, but rather may it spur you on all the more. For the more that your trials increase, so much the more will the crowns <of victory> be added to, and the prizes be multiplied that have been set aside for you for these fine contests.

XXV To Gemellus (79M)

spring 406

What is this? At a time when such a great and glorious a city is celebrating a joyous festival (for this is what I call your magistracy), you have filled me with even greater dejection by maintaining so long a silence. If it had been someone else among the multitude who had behaved thus,⁹² I would easily have discovered the cause. What is the cause? The vast majority of men, whenever they obtain a higher office, are wont to become haughty in spirit. But in the case of your magnificence – you who know how to be a philosopher and have accurately discerned the nature of these mortal affairs that are always in flux, you who are not deceived by cosmetics <on the cheek> or mascara <under the eyes>,⁹³ but discover the naked reality behind

92 John's Greek (ὁ τοῦτο πεπονθώς, that is, literally 'who had suffered this') is allusive and imprecise, presumably because he is trying to avoid criticism of Gemellus.

93 John was fond of the combination ἐπιτρίμματα and ὑπογραφαί, which he uses more

facial appearances –, I cannot discover the cause of your silence. I know full well that you love me just as much now as before, or rather even more now than before; but I am unable to say why you have been silent so long despite being so well disposed towards me, and for this very reason I am especially perplexed. Please resolve the riddle by a letter, if it is not a heavy or unwelcome <task>. And before <you write> that letter, please tell those who bring this letter to you (I mean my lord the most honourable and pious priest and those with him) that, as I am convinced, your silence was not <the result> of laziness. For my saying this will suffice for them to obtain kind treatment from your excellency.

XXVI To Marinius (128M)

spring 406

Spring is sweet for all other men, because it beautifies the face of the earth with flowers and makes everything a meadow, and it brings me the great comfort of associating with my companions by letter. I wished to gaze on you with my own eyes, but since that is not possible, I am doing what is possible with great eagerness, communicating with you by letter. Sailors and seafarers do not cleave the ridges of the sea with such pleasure, when that time of year arrives, as I lay my hands on pen, paper and ink, ready to write to your diligence. For because ice has frozen everything well beyond the winter season and an unspeakable volume of snow is <still> blocking the roads, no-one has either been able to reach me from elsewhere nor to stir from here. Hence I too, since confined in the small huts here as if I were in prison and restrained with (as it were) a shackle on my tongue, that is, by a lack of couriers, have long been silent against my will. But since the season has now opened the highways for travel and loosed the fetters on my tongue, I have despatched from here the priest who is with me and sent him to your nobility to find out about your health. Welcome him therefore as befits you, my most admirable lord, and after you have seen him with the love befitting you, ask him to inform me about your health when he returns. For you know how eager I am to learn about it.

than twenty times; our translation is based on John's physical description of the great 'whore of Babylon' (Revelation 17.1–6) in a letter to Olympias (10.12a: ἐπιτρίμμασι παρειῶν, ὑπογραφαῖς ὀφθαλμῶν).

XXVII To the lady Proba⁹⁴ in Rome (168M)

spring 406

Although we are separated by a vast intervening journey, I have received an exact experience of your genuine and warm love just as if I were present and witnessed all your actions <with my own eyes>, since those who reach me from where you are report just what I desired to learn about your diligence. For this I owe a great debt of gratitude to you and feel proud and preen myself on the attitude of your nobility, and I commend my beloved <friends>, the most devout priest John and the most honourable deacon Paul, to your decorum, entrusting them into your hands as into a haven. Please deign to give them the reception that befits you, my most esteemed and noble lady. For you know how great the reward will be for your kindness. And when it is possible, inform me immediately about your state of health, about which I am most eager to learn since I greatly cherish it.

XXVIII To Juliana and those with her (169M)

spring 406

As the judgment is more severe on those who have committed such illegalities, to precisely the same amount will the reward be greater for you who have exerted yourselves to undo these great illegalities and have expended so much toil and effort. For I am not unaware of the good deeds of your disposition and the eagerness that you have shown in the present matter and in your kindness towards those who have made the journey from me to you. Hence I owe you a debt of gratitude, and entreat you to retain your enthusiasm and to show an even stronger perseverance and courage. For you know how great a thing is virtuous action and how great is the reward you will receive for quelling this disturbance and so furious a tempest, at least as concerns you, and bringing the appropriate correction to the evils that have occurred.

XXIX To Italica (170M)

spring 406

As in external matters, as if by nature, so too in action and the conduct of business the two sexes, men and women, are distinct. For to women is assigned the care of the home, to men participation in political and business affairs. In contests on God's behalf and in labours for the Church, however, this is impossible: on the contrary, it is quite possible for a woman to join in these fine contests and labours with greater strength than a man. Making this clear in his letter to your ancestral city, Paul gives the names of many women

⁹⁴ The Greek has Πρόβη ἐλευθέρα, which Montfaucon rendered as *Probae matronae* (1721, 696).

(Romans 16), saying that they have endured no small labours in reforming their husbands and leading them to appropriate behaviour. Why do I say this? So that you do not consider it alien to you to embark with eagerness on the labours which contribute to the restoring of order in the Church; but, as is appropriate for you, both through yourself and through others to whom it may be possible, apply fitting zeal so as to resolve the universal swell of disturbance that has seized the churches of the East. For the heavier the swell and the more violent the storm have become, so much the greater will be the reward of you <women> who choose to do and to suffer anything in order to bring back the peace that has been disrupted and to endeavour to restore to a fitting state everything that has been disrupted.

XXX To Gemellus (132M)

summer 406

Bless me! How great a thing is a noble and youthful soul, owing everything to itself and not to anything extraneous, deriving from itself both pleasure and security and, what is truly remarkable, <doing so> from matters that appear to most people to be fearful and dangerous! For how great is the understanding and philosophy that is shown by not only an absence of grievance and distress when one is hated by some, but also by taking pride in this, and not merely taking pride, but also pitying those who display hatred and desiring that they change and become good? For this we praise and admire you, most admirable and most magnificent lord, for this I too rejoice greatly, as if for a glorious crown of victory, since I am elevated by the friendship of your magnificence.

Since in your letter you ask for prayers, please be aware that even before this letter I have not ceased praying to see your great and philosophic soul soon take part in the holy rite and receive the privilege of those holy and fearsome mysteries. If I am able to share in these glad tidings, I am released from my present exile, I forget this desolate place and I am freed from the weakness of body against which I am now struggling. I know, my most admirable lord, that you are eager and desirous of the privilege of receiving these secret benefits through my humble self, and I, as you yourself know, am very eager for this. But, if my <participation> is postponed, let this <initiation> not suffer any postponement. For you will prosper even if I am absent, since there are very true men who can guide you towards this mystical initiation. And if this happens, I shall have exactly the same pleasure as if I had been present to assist at the giving of this heavenly gift, since the grace <received> will be the same.

APPENDIX A
THE COUNCIL OF THE OAK
(Photius, *Bibliotheca* 59, 17a–19a Bekker)¹

Read: <the acts> of the council illegally assembled against saint John the Golden Mouth, at which those presiding were Theophilus of Alexandria, Acacius of Beroea, Antiochus of Ptolemais, Severianus of Gabala and Quirinus of Chalcedon, who had the most hostile attitude towards the man and who simultaneously played all three roles of judges, accusers and witnesses. This <case> was transacted in thirteen dossiers: twelve <sessions> against the saint, with the thirteenth containing the proceedings against Heraclides, who was consecrated by him in <the see of> Ephesus, but whose deposition they did not succeed in completing because some other <matters> prevented them.

The <formal> accuser of Heraclides was the bishop of Magnesia, who was called Macarius. But the open enemy and first accuser of the blessed John was his deacon John. His accusations against the Golden Mouth were:

- (1) that he had done him wrong by suspending him from his duties² on the grounds that he had beaten his own young slave Eulalius;
- (2) that a certain monk John reported that he had been beaten, whipped and put in irons together with the demoniacs on the instructions of the Golden Mouth;
- (3) that <John> had sold a large quantity of church valuables;³
- (4) that he had sold the marble belonging to the church of Saint Anastasia,⁴ which Nectarius had put aside for marble panelling in the church;

1 The standard modern edition is that of Henry 1959, 52–57, which Malingrey 1988, 100–14, reprints without its critical apparatus, but after verifying its accuracy against the two main manuscripts. For earlier translations, see Wilson 1994, 38–41; Kelly 1995, 299–310; we offer a new translation purely for the convenience of readers.

2 For the technical sense of the verb ἀφορίζω, see Lampe 279, s.v. C.

3 The charge was supported by a list of gold, silver and sacerdotal vestments allegedly purloined by John (Palladius, *Dial.* 3.90–96).

4 On this recently built church, see Janin 1953, 26–29.

- (5) that he insulted his clergy as worthless, corrupt, good-for-nothings⁵ and common labourers;⁶
- (6) that he called Saint Epiphanius a chatterbox and miniature devil;⁷
- (7) that he had concocted a plot against Severianus, inciting the servants of the church⁸ <to violence> against him;
- (8) that he had composed a book defaming the clergy;⁹
- (9) that he had convened an assembly of all the clergy and brought before it the three deacons, Acacius, Edaphius and John, accusing them of stealing his cowl, saying that they had taken it for some other purpose;
- (10) that he had consecrated Antonius¹⁰ as a bishop even though he had been convicted of tomb robbery;
- (11) that he had personally denounced the *comes* Johannes during the riot provoked by the soldiers;¹¹

5 The intended meaning seems quite clear, even though the noun αὐτοπαράχρηστος is not attested elsewhere.

6 Palladius, *Dial.* 19.93–102, confirms that John sometimes criticized his clergy very harshly. John himself seems to have coined the word τριοβολμαῖος, which alludes to the fact that three obols was both the traditional daily wage of labourers in Aristophanes (*Wasps* 684; *Peace* 125) and the daily allowance for jurymen and members attending the assembly under the Athenian democracy (LSJ 1825, with *Supp.* 143, which gives the metaphorical sense ‘two-penny-halfpenny’ as a term of contempt).

7 On the visit of Epiphanius of Salamis to Constantinople in 403 and his public quarrel with John, see Socrates, *HE* 6.12–14.

8 Originally an astronomical and astrological term, the noun *dekanos* early came to be used of humble police officers (LSJ 376, s.v. δέκανος) and John applied the word to humble subordinates of the praetorian prefect (*PG* 63.109). No other source mentions the *dekanoi* as being used to expel Severianus.

9 The work in question was identified as John’s *On suspect cohabitations* (*CPG* 4311: *PG* 47.495–514 = Dumortier 1955, 44–94) by Leclercq 1908, 142 n.2: ‘le livre visé par l’article 8^e n’est autre que le fameux traité contre les sœurs agapètes’.

10 Wilson 1994, 39, 41 n.1, 116, changes the name to Antoninus, whom he identifies as the bishop of Ephesus, citing Photius’ summary of George of Alexandria on John (Photius, *Bibliotheca* 96, 81a Bekker). But Antoninus’ most serious alleged crime was that ‘he accepted money for ordinations’, which was not a capital crime, though tomb robbery certainly was; see *CTh* 3.16.1 (332); 9.17.1 (340), 2 (349), 3 (353/355), 4 (356 or 357), 5 (363), 6 (381), 7 (386); *Anth. Pal.* 8. 253.

11 The substance of this charge appears to be that John denied Johannes asylum in church during Gainas’ coup in April 400, even though he had given sanctuary to Eutropius after the eunuch’s fall from power in the previous year; see Cameron 1988, 39, who argues convincingly that the subject of the homily to which an ancient editor has mistakenly attached the heading ‘When Eutropius was taken away after being found outside the church’ (*CPG* 4528: *PG* 52.395–414) was Johannes, not Eutropius, and that John delivered it in April in order to

- (12) that he failed to pray either when entering or when leaving his church;
- (13) that he performed ordinations of deacons and priests without an altar;¹²
- (14) that he had consecrated four bishops in a single ordination ceremony;
- (15) that he received individual women in private, sending everyone else away;
- (16) that he had sold the legacy left by Thecla¹³ through the agency of Theodulus;
- (17) that no-one knew where the income of the church went;
- (18) that he ordained Sarapion priest although he was under indictment;¹⁴
- (19) that he showed no concern for members of the worldwide church who had been incarcerated on his say-so and had died in prison, and he had not even deigned to escort their bodies to burial;
- (20) that he had insulted the most holy Acacius¹⁵ and had not mentioned him in any sermon;
- (21) that he had handed the priest Porphyrius over to Eutropius to be exiled;
- (22) that he had also handed over the priest Venerius using much violence;¹⁶
- (23) that the bath was heated for him alone, and after he had bathed, Sarapion barred access to it so that no-one else could bathe;
- (24) that he had ordained many without verifying their credentials;
- (25) that he was in the habit of eating alone and gluttonously, living just like <Homer's> Cyclopes;¹⁷

justify his actions on that occasion (1988, 33–48).

12 That is, John is accused of ordaining priests and deacons other than in church on a Sunday after the Eucharist; for the normal procedure, see Tixeront 1925, 108–25.

13 Thecla appears to be otherwise unknown (*PLRE* 2.1064, Thecla 1).

14 Sarapion was one of John's deacons, whom Severianus, who had been crossed by him, had persuaded John to expel from his clergy before the council (Socrates, *HE* 6.4.2, 11 version A 12–19/version B 12–17). After the Council of the Oak, which ordered John to bring Sarapion to appear before it, John consecrated him bishop of Heraclea, but he was deposed in 404, tortured and exiled to Egypt, his homeland (Palladius, *Dial.* 8.159, 20.44–47; Socrates, *HE* 6.15.15, 17.12).

15 The bishop of Beroea; his hostility towards John is recorded in the *Funerary Speech* (§§ 45, 102, 108) and by Palladius, *Dial.* 3.49; 6.8–14.

16 Porphyrius and Venerius are otherwise unknown.

17 Palladius, *Dial.* 12.15–25 justifies John's practice of eating alone. The Cyclopes consumed without ever needing to expend any labour on growing wheat, barley or vines for the wine they quaffed (*Odyssey* 9.106–11).

- (26) that he acted simultaneously as accuser, witness and judge – and they said that it was clear from the cases of his archdeacon Martyrius and Prohaeresius, the Lycian bishop;¹⁸
- (27) that he had punched Memnon¹⁹ in the face in the Church of the Holy Apostles and administered communion to him while blood was flowing from his mouth;
- (28) that he vested and divested himself while chewing a piece of bread on the bishop's throne;²⁰
- (29) that he gave funds to the bishops consecrated by him so that he might oppress the clergy through them.

These in summary were the <charges> against the Saint. But he refused to appear, although summoned four times,²¹ proclaiming to those who delivered the summons: 'If you remove my declared enemies from the list of those who are sitting in judgment, I am ready to present and defend myself, no matter who accuses me of what; but if you are unwilling to do this, nothing will be accomplished, no matter how often you summon me.'²²

They examined the first and the second of these heads of accusation in their own fashion, then they began to examine the cases of Heraclides and Palladius, the bishop of Helenopolis. The monk John, whom the deacon John had mentioned in his accusations against the Golden Mouth, in his turn presented a petition against Heraclides charging that he was an Origenist and a thief, having been caught red-handed in Caesarea in Palestine stealing the clothes of the deacon Aquilinus, and that the bishop John (as he alleged) had consecrated him to <the see of> Ephesus even though <he knew that> such was his character. John also alleged against the Golden Mouth that he had suffered greatly because of the Origenists through Sarapion and at <the bishop's> own hands.²³ When these <matters> had been examined, the nineteenth head of accusation was examined again, and then the twenty-seventh.

18 Prohaeresius' see is not known.

19 Memnon is otherwise unknown.

20 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.72–73, records the different accusation that John instructed communicants to drink a little water or swallow a tiny piece of bread to avoid involuntarily spitting out a morsel of the holy sacrament (cf. § 76).

21 Sozomen, *HE* 8.17.10.

22 Palladius, *Dial.* 8.190–213, quotes what he claims to be the full text of John's reply.

23 In her note on this passage, Malingrey 1988, 108 n.2, cites the paper 'L'accusation d'origénisme contre saint Jean Chrysostom', which Ommeslaeghe delivered at the Ninth International Patristic Conference in Oxford in 1983; it was never published and is absent from the bibliography of his scholarly writings in Straeten 1995, 11–12.

Next the bishop Isaac²⁴ renewed the accusation against Heraclides that he was an Origenist who had not been received by the most holy Epiphanius either to pray or to dine with him. The same Isaac presented a petition against the Golden Mouth containing these <charges>:

- (1) concerning John the monk, who has often been mentioned, that he was flayed on account of the Origenists and put in irons;
- (2) that the blessed Epiphanius refused to be in communion <with John> because of the Origenists Ammonius, Euthymius, Eusebius,²⁵ Heraclides and Palladius;
- (3) that he set hospitality at nought by habitually eating alone;
- (4) that he said in church that the <holy> table was filled with Furies;²⁶
- (5) that he boasted in church, saying 'I am madly in love,'²⁷ without explaining, as he ought to have done, who the Furies were and what he meant by 'I am madly in love,' since the church does not know these <expressions>;
- (6) that he provided *carte blanche* for sinners by teaching that: 'If you sin again, repent again, and every time that you sin, come to me and I will cure you';²⁸
- (7) that he blasphemed in church by saying that Christ was not heard when he prayed because he did not pray in the required manner;²⁹

24 Palladius, *Dial.* 6.16, introduces Isaac, who was not in fact a bishop, but the leader of the monks in Constantinople, as an ally of the bishops Acacius, Severianus and Antiochus, introducing him as 'a shameless little Syrian, a ringleader of false monks'.

25 Ammonius, Euthymius and Eusebius were three of the Tall Brothers (Palladius, *Dial.* 6.118, 8.8); the fourth was Dioscorus. All four had been members of the group of monks which Evagrius Ponticus (345–99) had gathered around him at Kellia near Nitria; Dioscorus had been made bishop of a new see close to Alexandria to supervise the community, but in 400 Theophilus hounded all four out of Egypt (Kelly 1995, 191). Dioscorus and Ammonius both died before the Council of the Oak.

26 John had used the words 'table of the Furies' (τράπεζα τῶν Ἑρινύων) in a homily on Paul's *Second Letter to the Corinthians* when he spoke of the execution of John the Baptist and asked Salome 'Why do you seek the table of the Furies?' (PG 61.594).

27 We suspect that the words 'I am in love, I feel mad' (to render the Greek literally) are a deliberate misquotation of the sentence 'I love you and I feel mad' from John's *Homily on Psalm 50* (PG 55.585).

28 Socrates, *HE* 6.21.4–6, reports that John incurred censure by disregarding the ruling of the council that only one post-baptismal lapse could be forgiven and by inviting into his church anyone who had sinned and repented a thousand times.

29 This charge appears to be based on John's homilies *On the Prayers of Christ against the Anomoeans* 9, 10 (PG 48.777–96).

- (8) that he instigated the laity of the church to riot against the council;
- (9) that he received pagans who had done a great deal of harm to the Christians;³⁰
- (10) that he encroached upon others' spheres of jurisdiction and consecrated bishops <in them>;³¹
- (11) that he insulted the bishops and ordered them to be thrown out of his house without ceremony;³²
- (12) that he insulted the clergy with strange insults;
- (13) that he seized the deposits of others by force;
- (14) that he performed ordinations without a meeting of his clergy and against their advice;
- (15) that he <not only> received Origenists, while not obtaining the release of those in communion with the church who arrived with letters of recommendation³³ and were thrown into prison, but he also paid them no respect whatever when they died;³⁴
- (16) that he ordained as bishops slaves belonging to others who had not yet been freed and who had a bad reputation;
- (17) that as a result this Isaac himself had suffered many wrongs at their hands.

Of these accusations, the first, which, so they deemed, had been examined before, was not examined again, but the second and seventh were. Next was examined the third charge of those submitted by the deacon John. Under this heading the senior priest³⁵ Arsacius, who succeeded the Golden Mouth and Atticus (I know not how)³⁶ presented themselves as witnesses and testified

30 Probably a reference to John's granting of temporary asylum to the eunuch Eutropius in 399, which offended those who had encompassed his fall from power; John's homily on Eutropius while he sheltered him in his church (*CPG* 4392: *PG* 52.393–94) probably also offended others besides the politicians by its tone and content (Kelly 1995, 147–51).

31 This charge is emphasized by Palladius, *Dial.* 7.132–36; 8.169.

32 The transmitted reading 'ἐκπυγμάτων', though printed by Henry and defended by Malingrey 1988, 111 n.5, is surely corrupt; Wilson 1994, 41 n.5, translates 'in disgrace' and observes that 'no convincing conjecture has been made'.

33 Such letters about individuals from one Christian community to another had been common since the time of the Apostle Paul (2 Corinthians 3.1).

34 This repeats the nineteenth of the charges brought by the deacon John.

35 Arsacius was the senior priest in John's clergy. The only other early *prōtopresbuteroi* known are Peter in Alexandria under Theophilus (Socrates, *HE* 6.9.3–8) and Asclepiades on Rhodes in 431 (*ACO* 1.1.7.138).

36 We have changed the punctuation of Henry and Malingrey to put the words 'I know not how' into parenthesis.

against the saint, as also did the priest Helpidius. These same men and with them also the priest Acacius testified against him on the fourth count.

When these matters had been examined, the above-mentioned priests together with Eudaimon and Onesimus demanded that the verdict be rendered quickly, and Paul the bishop of Herclea, who was presiding, requested all to declare their opinion. As their verdict, they pronounced the deposition of the saint, starting with bishop Gymnasius, ending with Theophilus of Alexandria and numbering forty-five in all. Then a letter was written to the clergy of Constantinople, supposedly in the name of the council, about the deposition of the saint,³⁷ and a report was made to the emperors.³⁸

Three petitions were added, from Gerontius,³⁹ Faustinus and Eugnomonius, who said that they had been unjustly condemned by John. There was also an imperial rescript to the council. This was the twelfth session <of the council>. The thirteenth, as has been said, concerned the case of Heraclides of Ephesus.

37 The synodical letter of the Council of the Oak has not been preserved.

38 The report sent to Arcadius by the council was, as etiquette demanded, formally addressed to both Arcadius and Honorius as joint Augusti; the apparent quotation from it in Palladius, *Dial.* 8.237–43, is surely a distorted paraphrase.

39 Gerontius should be the bishop of Nicomedia whom John deposed, presumably during his return journey from Ephesus to Constantinople early in 402 (Sozomen, *HE* 8.6.2–6; cf. Dagron 1974, 468 n.2).

APPENDIX B

THEODORET'S LOST ORATIONS ON JOHN

(CPG 6225: Photius, *Bibliotheca* 273, 507b–509a Bekker)

Read from the speeches of the blessed Theodoret, which he composed on Saint John the Golden Mouth: we have so far seen five of them, from which we have transcribed some extracts which are set out below.

The first of the five speeches seems to continue a previous speech or to be part of it. It commences from the point at which <John> arrived in Constantinople after being sent for and how he was installed as archbishop of the city and <it narrates> how he tried with all his might to restore the position of bishop and archbishop to its ancient distinction; how much the noble John achieved on the one hand by speaking out against Gainas, on the other by acting as an ambassador on public matters of state; and how envy decreed exile on him. Relating a few of the things accomplished by this remarkable man before his death, it omits many or rather most of them.

The next speech runs through some brief praises and is itself brief. It begins thus: 'Again we remember John.' The speech after this also observes the rules of encomia, but it differs from its predecessors by the beauty of its expression and thought. Its introduction begins thus: 'The present topic requires a trumpet with many notes, but I see that it now runs into danger because I have the tongue of a child, and the excellence of an athlete which deserves to be depicted with countless skills is now diminished because it falls to an artist like me to describe.' Such is the proemium.

'One man drags him along as a helper when he is arrested, another calls him as his advocate when he is brought into court, another who is hungry begs for food, another receives his clothes,⁴⁰ another needs to be comforted in his sorrow, another bellows to be released from his chains; someone else drags him along to visit the sick; a stranger asks him for lodging; another stands next to him and laments a debt; another summons him to investigate and to reconcile disputes within his house; not even a slave takes refuge

40 We have deleted the phrase 'naked without a garment' (γυμνὸς ὑπὲρ ἐνδυμάτων in the original Greek) as a gloss on the startling expression 'strips him of his clothes' (αὐτὸν ἀποδύει), which we have changed to 'receives his clothes', since a literal translation would strike the wrong tone.

with anyone else to lament the savage rage of his master; a widow cries “Take pity,” <while> another woman bewails her lack of children.⁴¹ Countless are the ways the father <provides> for every <need>, to every group and for every person. Someone is arrested and the father pleads on his behalf; hunger threatens and the advocate becomes a provider of food; someone falls ill and the provider of food is changed into a doctor; someone has succumbed to grief and the healer is discovered to be a source of comfort; care is needed for strangers, and the one who has been everything is revealed to have become the keeper of a hotel. What need is there to speak on each <role>? Corresponding to all the different periods which measured out his life (so that I do not speak only of his time as archbishop), the variety of his salvific actions did not fail to go forth among men.’

‘O soldier and hero after your death! O fighter grievous to your foes even after you were buried! O all-harmonious lyre whose tones were dissolved by death! O law courts condemned to lose so fluent an orator!⁴² O saving catch of fish for men snatched up to heaven! O tree divided between heaven and earth,⁴³ providing the body for one and the soul for the other! The mouth of the church is imprisoned in the grave! What an eye of piety has been seized from men! You have not died, blessed father, you have set like the sun! We grieve for you not as one who has died, but as one hidden from us: we seek you not as one who is dead, but as one who has migrated to heaven.’ Such <are the contents of> the third book.

The fourth book too continues the panegyric form, beginning its praises from the obligation to honour our fathers. From it come these <passages>:

‘John was one of these shepherds, the understanding free from evil, the mind with many eyes, the book of skilled knowledge of the Gospels, one more malleable than wax in resolving quarrels, an ocean of graces, unsullied in the face of deceptions of those who attacked him, the defensive wall of the church.’

‘No snake of hypocrisy escaped his notice.’

‘How do you wish me to demonstrate John’s excellence? From his hospitality? Who was a more generous host than John? From his firmness in championing just causes? What power intimidated him? From his enthusiasm in church matters? Whose articulation of the rhythms of the singing of

41 The context seems to impose this interpretation of ὀρφανία, even though the normal meaning of the word is ‘orphanhood’ (LSJ 1257).

42 The noun ὀρθμιστής, which we have translated as ‘orator’, is extremely rare; it has no entry in LSJ or LSJ *Supp.*

43 We emend the transmitted genitive γῆς to the accusative γῆν.

psalms by the choirs of the laity <has ever been finer> until now?’

This speech <contains> such <passages>. The next weaves the same garlands of panegyric, but expresses the force of its concepts somewhat more clearly. All these five speeches appear to have been composed after the transfer <of John’s relics> from exile. Part of the present speech are extracts in the following words.

‘Lend us your lyre, father, let us borrow your plectrum for praising you! For even if your hands have been loosed by the law of nature, yet your lyre sounds throughout the whole world by the gift of grace.’

‘Give us a share of that immortal tongue, for only your tongue is worthy to justify you.’

‘Because of this John <the Baptist> took away John, the one who spoke freely <took away> his emulator, the one who condemned after death <took away> the one who announced after death, the citizen of the desert <took away> the one who chastised a whole city.’

‘You have also another kinship with the apostles. You were the first to plant altars among the Scythians who live in wagons; and scarcely had the barbarian dismounted from his horse than he learned to bend the knee <in worship> and prostrate himself on the floor <in prayer>. He who could not be bent by the tears of captured prisoners learned to weep tears over his own sins. Moreover, you transfixed the Persian archer with <the arrow of> the Gospel message, and those famous iron-clad warriors worship the crucified one. Your tongue has vanquished the magic tricks of the Chaldeans and magi,⁴⁴ and the dry land of Persia has sprouted houses of prayer. The region of Babylon is no longer alien to pious <Christian> worship. These <achievements> have joined you to the apostles.’

‘The plants seeded by your tongue still flower among us; if anyone names John, a loud echo sounds afar.’

‘For the lyre of the church recognizes its ancient plectrum and the syllables of your name supply the fingers <to play it>.’

‘The imperial city used to look on silken fabrics from China and spit on them; it used to gaze upon precious stones from India and despise them; nor did the flower from Tyre that produces purple give it joy: it longed for a tongue of clay that poured forth imperishable streams of instruction.’

‘Ancient Ephesus saw you and called you the new John. It saw and remembered the thunder of the gospel.’

44 We delete the words ‘and the language of the Chaldeans and magi’ (καὶ ἡ γλῶττα Χαλδαίων καὶ μάγων).

‘After that, my beloved, the flow of his discourse became harsh; but let us not flee from his harshness, since peace leads the way in future by its flow.’

‘If you are at all angry with your deckhands, father, if you feel any annoyance towards those sailing with you, bear in mind that storm, waves and a raging sea have compelled them to throw a Jonah into the waves unwillingly (Jonah 1.9–16). What has happened is not their hatred, but your training; the events are not a war waged by them, but your contest <as a martyr>: they have not renounced their brotherly support, but it was necessary for you to run the full race expected of martyrs. An unspoken <divine> economy prepared a wrestling ring and a running course for you.’

‘Surely it was also about you that it was said to the common adversary of human nature: “Have you considered my servant John?” etc. (Job 1.8, 2.3).’

‘His glorious death was owed to his glorious life.’

‘The devil wrestled with Job and his friends seemed to offend him; it was for this reason that God later cured his friends and made Job again a friend to his friends. This is what has come about now, as I perceive, father; and I can visualize the right hands of the fathers <of the church> grasping one another. Job received back his property multiplied many times over; you have received an increase in the universal honour paid by all.’

Its heading states that this last speech was delivered in the Church of the Apostles <in Constantinople>, while the proemium suggests that the writer delivered his oration after others had spoken before him. For it runs as follows:

‘Since the circle bids me too to stand and speak, since the agreed signal rouses me to the common celebration, since I too must strike up a tune to praise our father, and many are those who are demanding the <repayment of a> debt which must be honoured, while I possess nothing that can equal the virtue of our father, please lend me your lyre, father John.’

APPENDIX C

JOHN IN THE CALENDAR OF THE CHURCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE

The *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, which Hippolyte Delehayé edited superbly in 1902, has entries relating to John on 14 September, 13 November, 15 December, 27 January and 26 February. They read as follows:

14 September (46.8–16)

On the same day there used to fall <commemoration of> the death of the saint our father and archbishop of this great city John the Golden Mouth. The feast venerating this the holy fathers moved to the thirteenth day of November on the grounds that it could not coincide with the Elevation <of the Holy Cross>. They acted correctly <to ensure> that he might be honoured separately in his own right and magnified to the glory of Christ our true God who glorified him.

13 November (217.39–219.15)

Remembrance [or exile]⁴⁵ of our father among the saints John, archbishop of Constantinople and Golden Mouth. It is celebrated instead of <the real date of> his death because that coincides with the Elevation of the Precious Cross. <John> came from the city of Antioch in Syria, his father being the general Secundus⁴⁶ and his mother Anthusa, a pious believer. Immediately from the beginning of his life he acquired a great love of letters and quickly read through all pagan and Christian literature. Because of his excellence he was made a member of the clergy by Meletius the patriarch of Antioch, and a deacon,⁴⁷ then priest by Flavianus. He expounded the whole of Holy Scripture, and when Nectarius the patriarch of Constantinople departed this life, he was summoned from Antioch by a vote of the bishops and at the

45 We delete these words as a gloss.

46 Secundus is absent from *PLRE* 1 and its list of ‘Military Commanders (Eastern), 284–395’ (1118–21). The noun στρατηλάτης is a generic word for ‘commander of an army’ and does not designate a specific rank. It is possible, therefore, that ‘Secundus’ here is a distortion of an original ‘Secundinus’, even though other bearers of that name appear to be westerners; a Secundinus was *dux Osrhoenae* in 363 (Ammianus 24.1.2).

47 The Greek transmits the word διάκονος in the wrong place.

command of the emperor Arcadius and installed as archbishop of the ruling city. By denouncing greed and avarice he came into conflict with the empress Eudoxia, was unjustly exiled by her to Cucusus in Armenia <and> died there.

(We omit the description of John's physique, which follows [219.15–220.4].)

13 November: another, fuller version, which adds significant details, is edited by Delehaye below the main text (219.20–28 + 221–222.34–36)⁴⁸ <Day> of John the Golden Mouth, archbishop of Constantinople. He was from the city of Antioch in Syria, his father being the general Secundus and his mother Anthusa, a pious believer. Immediately from the beginning of his life he acquired a great love of letters. Because of his eager application to these and his natural acuteness he investigated all the wisdom of the Greeks and became a pupil of the sophists Libanius and Andragathius in Antioch and then of those in Athens.⁴⁹ Having also studied Holy Scripture well and attained perfect knowledge of it and having adorned his life with holiness and purity, he received tonsure as a cleric from Meletius the patriarch of Antioch who is among the saints. Then he was ordained priest by Meletius' successor and delivered sermons numerous beyond counting about repentance and moral character, expounding the whole of divinely inspired scripture.

When Nectarius the bishop of Constantinople departed this life, <John> was summoned from Antioch by a vote of the bishops and at the command of the emperor Arcadius and installed as archbishop of the ruling city, receiving consecration according to church law. He extended more widely his enthusiasm for expounding scripture and his teaching in disputations, by which he brought many to knowledge of God and many to repentance after a dissolute and wanton life, levering out as it were and driving away the sufferings of human souls by his incessant teaching. He gave himself over to continence and asceticism so greatly that he took only a little barley broth and brief sleep, and this not on a bed, but standing and beaten by ropes if he ever faltered and tried to sit down. By his extreme generosity to the needy he became a model for many others in this respect: hence in his sermons he taught that people should instinctively be inclined to this virtue and refrain from self-aggrandizement.

48 On the manuscript, which contains the longer entries for 13 November and 27 January translated here, see Delehaye's preface (1902, xxi–xxii).

49 John did not in fact study in Athens as Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa had in the 350s (Gregory of Nazianzus, *On his Life* 211, 221–36; cf. Bernardi 2004, 149 n.50).

For this reason he made himself hated by the empress Eudoxia. For she had seized the vineyard of a widow, and the widow was creating a disturbance demanding the return of her property. The saint urged the empress not to retain what belonged to another and criticized her when she refused to accept his advice: she could not control herself and kept possession of the vineyard, and the saint pilloried her by comparing her to Jezebel. She turned savage and drove him from his bishop's throne, first by herself and second through bishops who acted in the service of those in power rather than of piety. Since the accusations against him were judged to be trivial, he was restored to his church, although her rage persisted <while> those who had been instigated <to act> against the saint did not repent of their sins, but <considered> how they might by accusing him with greater slander and sycophancy appear to have removed him justifiably from his bishop's throne. This they did and soon received the reward of such action.

The saint, having been marched around and subjected to many hardships, finally surrendered his precious soul to God in Cucusus in Armenia. But they, as their history shows, destroyed their souls after being tested by terrible diseases immediately after his departure from his see, with Eudoxia being the first to suffer this as the first to transgress and the one who led the bishops by her lies to ruin him. They say that after her death the coffin in which he had been buried for thirty-two years was moved to prove the injustice done to the Golden Mouth. When the precious relic was brought back and deposited where it now is – this very action made an earthquake cease.

15 December (312.22–314.3)

It should be noted that our father saint John of the Golden Mouth was on this day consecrated⁵⁰ patriarch of Constantinople the New Rome, and on this day the feast of the Nativity of Christ began to be celebrated by him <lasting> until the twenty-fifth day of the month, after some people came from the West and announced it.⁵¹ Hence a very fine and beautiful speech was delivered by him in defence <of the practice>.

27 January (425.21–30)

The return of the precious relics of our father Saint John Chrysostom from Comana in Armenia, which happened in the times of Theodosius the Younger, thirty-three years after his death,⁵² under the patriarch Saint

50 In a context such as this, the verb χειροτονέω normally means 'appoint' or 'ordain by the imposition of hands' (Lampe 1522–23).

51 On this notice, see Barnes (forthcoming).

52 In fact, after thirty years and four months (from September 407 to January 438).

Proclus. When his precious relics had been brought to Constantinople, they were deposited under the high altar of <the Church of> the Holy Apostles, where his eucharist is performed.

27 January: another, longer version, edited by Delehay below the main text, which adds details both historical and legendary (425–426.41–55 + 427–428.32–41)

<Commemoration> of John the archbishop of Constantinople, the Golden Mouth. This blessed and divine prelate was exiled because of the purity of his life and his refusal to disregard justice even when the wrongdoers were the emperor and his wife themselves. And first <he was sent> to Cucusus, a small and rundown town, then to Arabissus, then to Pityus, places which were not only isolated and lacking the necessities of life, but also under constant attack from the neighbouring Isaurians. After being in these places, turning many to the knowledge of God and performing very many miracles, he departed from life, with the apostles Peter and John standing over the great John and summoning him to reside where he desired. But the divine martyrs Basiliscus⁵³ and Lucian⁵⁴ also stood over <him> and announced his translation with them.

With how much pleasure the emperor, the holy senate and the rest of the people welcomed his presence is shown by their going across the water to meet him, the singing of hymns all night long, the carrying of torches and the rest of the spiritual rejoicing. When the precious coffin had been brought into the Church of Saint Irene and his holy body had been placed on the bishop's throne, the crowd inside the church cried: 'Receive back your throne, holy one!' Then the precious coffin was placed in the emperor's carriage and taken to the church named after the Holy Apostles, where,⁵⁵ after the saint had been taken to the holy seat and placed on the divine throne, he mystically moved his previously silent lips and pronounced a benediction on the congregation. He was then deposited in the coffin prepared <for him>, which is concealed under the ground beneath the holy altar. After the holy and divine eucharist had been completed, many miracles were performed. <There was> a man in the grip of a most grievous disease, who had been ill for a very long time with an affliction of the limbs that left him in pain and

⁵³ Basiliscus was a bishop and martyr who was interred at Comana Pontica; he is said to have appeared to John in a vision the night before his death (Palladius, *Dial.* 11.120–29; Theodoret, *HE* 5.34.9; Sozomen, *HE* 8.27.3).

⁵⁴ That is, Lucian of Antioch, who was executed at Nicomedia on 6 January 312 (Barnes 2005).

⁵⁵ Our translation omits the plural participle καταλαμβάντες in 427–428.33 as intrusive.

unable to move, his whole body paralysed, who had despaired of healing from doctors. As soon as this man touched the coffin, he was immediately released from his suffering and received such grace from the dead body that he moved, was active, recovered perfect health and gave thanks to holy God. Thus does God know how to glorify in return those who glorify him.

26 February (492.26–28)

Commemoration of the day when the holy John the Golden Mouth was ordained priest.

*

The entries for 15 December and 26 February require discussion together, since Socrates states that John was enthroned as bishop of Constantinople on 26 February 398, not on 15 December 397.⁵⁶ It appears to have been Pagi who first suggested, in his voluminous corrections to Baronius' *Annales Ecclesiastici*, that, although John was elected on 15 December 397, he was not actually enthroned as bishop until more than two months later on 26 February 398 (Pagi 1705, 2:25). This chronology then became canonical in modern scholarship⁵⁷ and is reflected even in the titles of recent studies of John's activities in Constantinople 'between 398 and 404'.⁵⁸ It relies on the postulate that the ecclesiastical historian Socrates, who is normally an impeccable source for events in Constantinople and states many other dates correctly and accurately,⁵⁹ drew an implicit distinction between two events which happened several weeks apart, that is, that when he states that John was 'elected to the priesthood of the episcopate and enthroned' (*HE* 6.2.11), he distinguishes between the election of John as bishop of Constantinople by a council of bishops on 15 December 397 and his installation and enthronement in his cathedral Church of Hagia Sophia on 26 February 398 more than two months later.⁶⁰ But there are very strong reasons for accepting the date of 15 December 397 for both John's election and his consecration as bishop.⁶¹

⁵⁶ Socrates, *HE* 6.2.11.

⁵⁷ Thus, for example, Stilling 1868, 511, 697; Baur 1930, 19–20; Dagron 1974, 464–65; Cameron 1987, 345–46; B. Baldwin, A. Kazhdan and R.S. Nelson, *ODB* 2:1057; Mayer and Allen 2000, 8; Barnes 2001, 328; Liebeschuetz 2011, 125.

⁵⁸ Tiersch 2002a; 2002b.

⁵⁹ Barnes 1993, 200–04, 212–17.

⁶⁰ Pagi 1705, 2:25 no. xx: 'Socrates diem illum, non ad Chrysostomi ordinationem, sed ad eius entronismum manifeste refert.' As it so often does, the adverb 'obviously' conceals a serious gap in the argument.

⁶¹ Brändle 1999, 61.

The normal procedure when priests or deacons were elected bishops was for them to be consecrated at once and without any delay. Moreover, in John's case there are specific reasons why it is most implausible to imagine an interval of more than two months between his election and his consecration. First, it is hard to see how or why the official calendar of the Church of Constantinople could be mistaken over the day on which John became bishop of the city. For John's name was restored to the official list of bishops of the city before October 423 by Atticus, who restored John's memory in an effort to reunite John's followers, the Johannites, with the mainstream Christians of Constantinople.⁶² Could both groups have forgotten the date of John's consecration within sixteen years of his death? Second, as Kelly pertinently observed, 'the lapse of five months since Nektarios' death has never been satisfactorily explained', from which he correctly deduced that the date of 15 December 397 deserves preference.⁶³ Third, the day and month stated by Socrates for John's consecration as bishop are those which the official calendar of the Church of Constantinople gives for John's ordination as a priest. Hence the most economical resolution of the contradiction in the evidence is that Socrates (or his source) has confused the day on which John was consecrated bishop in Constantinople in 397 with the day on which he had been ordained a priest in Antioch in 386.

Two possible objections to the hypothesis that John was installed as bishop of Constantinople on 15 December 397 must be considered. (1) The 44th of John's 55 *Homilies on Acts*, which were delivered in Constantinople during late 400 and early 401,⁶⁴ states that John has been bishop for a triennium (*PG* 60.312: *τριετίαν*), while the 41st of the same series of homilies refers to the earthquakes of 400 as having occurred 'last year' (*PG* 60.291: *πέρυσιν*). It might seem, therefore, that a triennium counting backwards from early 401 points to 398 rather than 397 as the year in which John became bishop of Constantinople. But in ancient Greek and Latin writers the term 'triennium' is an elastic one, being stretched or compressed to suit the argument or wishes of the author, so that a triennium can be as short as two years and a few days or as long as a little short of four years. Moreover, John is applying to himself the words of Paul to the elders of the city of Ephesus in Acts (20.31: *τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐπανόμην μετὰ δακρύων νοουθετῶν ἓνα ἕκαστον*). Hence the triennium of John's 44th *Homily on Acts* is equally compatible with both dates for his consecration as bishop

62 Socrates, *HE* 7.25.2.

63 Kelly 1995, 106.

64 Cameron 1987, 344–51.

(15 December 397 and 26 February 398). (2) The chronicle of Marcellinus registers John's replacement of Nectarius as bishop of Constantinople as the third of four entries for the year 398, in which he offers a potted biography of John.⁶⁵ However, none of Marcellinus' entries for 398 properly belongs in this year. The first records the election of Anastasius as bishop of Rome: in fact, Anastasius' predecessor Siricius died on 26 November 399.⁶⁶ The second entry notes the death of Ambrose of Milan, who died on 4 April 397,⁶⁷ and the fourth is a brief narrative of the rebellion of Gildo in North Africa, which began in the autumn of 397.⁶⁸ Marcellinus' date of 398 for John's consecration as bishop, therefore, carries no weight; on the contrary, his association of it with events of 397 favours the earlier year.

65 Marcellinus 398.3, continued and completed in 403.3.

66 Kelly 1986, 35–36.

67 Paulinus, *Life of Ambrose* 48.

68 *PLRE* 1.395–96, Gildo; cf. Cameron 1970, 93–102; Barnes 1978.

APPENDIX D

CONCORDANCE TO THE *FUNERARY SPEECH*

This brief concordance between (1) the pages, each in two columns, of the *Funerary Speech* in the Paris manuscript (P), (2) the chapters in Wallraff's edition of 2007, and (3) the columns in Migne's reprint of the excerpts published by Angelo Mai has the purely practical purpose of enabling readers of books and articles on John which refer to the *Funerary Speech* by the pages of the Paris manuscript (P) to correlate these references with Wallraff's edition and our translation, which follows his numeration of chapters.

P 453b–57a	Wallraff §§ 1–6
P 457a–61b	Wallraff §§ 6–12
P 461b–72a	Wallraff §§ 13–26
P 472b–79a	Wallraff §§ 27–37
P 479a–83b	Wallraff §§ 37–46
P 483b–86b	Wallraff §§ 46–51
P 486b–90b	Wallraff §§ 52–59
P 491a–500b	Wallraff §§ 60–77
P 500b–03b	Wallraff §§ 77–82
P 503b–18b	Wallraff §§ 83–109
P 518b–30b	Wallraff §§ 110–32
P 530b–36a	Wallraff §§ 133–44 <i>PG</i> 47.xliii–lii

APPENDIX E

CONCORDANCE TO EDITIONS OF PALLADIUS, *HISTORICAL DIALOGUE*

We have throughout referred to Palladius' *Historical Dialogue* by the chapter divisions and lines in the edition by Anne-Marie Malingrey and Philippe Leclercq (1988). For the convenience of readers who consult either the edition by P.R. Coleman-Norton (1928) or the English translation by R.T. Meyer (1985), we provide a concordance keyed to Malingrey's edition. Coleman-Norton notes the chapter divisions, which are in the manuscript, in the margins of his edition, while Meyer, who uses Malingrey's division into chapters, adds headings and subdivides each chapter with subordinate headings, some of which are quite witty (e.g., p. 33: 'Grey hairs no guarantee of wisdom').

<i>Malingrey</i> (chapter+lines)	<i>Coleman Norton</i> (pages+lines)	<i>Meyer</i> (pages)
3.10–8.2	11–17	
John, <i>Letter to Innocentius</i>	8.4–16.5	17–24
3.1–157	16.7–22.8	24–29
4.1–188	22.9–27.34	29–34
5.1–166	28.1–33.15	34–40
6.1–139	33.16–38.8	40–44
7.1–136	39.9–42.24	44–49
8.1–255	42.25–51.12	49–57
9.1–241	51.13–59.8	57–65
10.1–121	59.9–63.14	65–69
11.1–156	63.15–69.3	69–73
12.1–352	69.4–79.3	74–84
13.1–176	79.4–84.7	84–90
14.1–164	84.8–89.17	90–95
15.1–107	89.18–93.4	95–98
16.1–324	93.5–102.30	99–109
17.1–224	103.1–111.17	110–16
18.1–310	111.18–120.2	116–24
19.1–199	120.3–125.13	125–31
20.1–677	125.14–147.26	131–51

APPENDIX F

CONCORDANCE TO JOHN'S *LETTERS TO OLYMPIAS*

We have throughout cited John's *Letters to Olympias* according to their numbering in the edition by Anne-Marie Malingrey (1968); for the convenience of readers we here correlate the number assigned to each letter by Malingrey with its traditional number, its known or probable place of composition and the date proposed for it by Roland Delmaire (1991, 176).

<i>Malingrey</i>	<i>Migne, PG 52.549–624</i>	<i>Place of writing (if known)</i>	<i>Date proposed by Delmaire</i>
1	11		end of June 404
2	10		3 July 404
3	9	near Caesarea in Cappadocia	early August 404
4	12	Caesarea	mid-August 404
5	8		mid-August 404
6	13	Cucusus	mid-September 404
7	1	Cucusus	late September/ October 404
8	2	Cucusus	October 404
9	14	Cucusus	end of November 404
10	2	Cucusus	October 404
11	5	Cucusus	early 405
12	6	Cucusus	spring 405
13	7	Cucusus	summer 405
14	16	Cucusus	405
15	15	Arabissos	spring 406
16	17	Cucusus	end of 406
17	4	Cucusus	spring 407 ⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Kelly 1995, 260, dates the letter almost a year earlier and holds that John wrote it in Arabissos before he returned to Cucusus.



Map of Asia Minor

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANCIENT AUTHORS

Eunapius

R.P.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus* (Liverpool, 1981; 1983)

Heraclides of Nyssa,

Life of Olympias (BHG 1374–75; *Auctarium*, p. 143 = CPG 6040)

H. Delehay, ‘Vita sanctae Olympiadis et Narratio Sergiae de eiusdem translatione’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 15 (1896): 400–23; the *Life* is transmitted anonymously; its author was convincingly identified as Heraclides by Honigmann, 1953, 111–16

John Chrysostom

For complete editions of John’s writings, see the List of Abbreviations, s.v. Montfaucon, Savile. The following editions of individual works have been cited:

J. Dumortier, *Saint Jean Chrysostome. Les cohabitations suspectes* (Paris, 1955)

A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome: Lettres à Olympias*, 2nd edn, SC 13bis (1968), 406–49 (Greek text with French translation *en face*). Revised version of *Jean Chrysostome: Lettres à Olympias*, SC 13 (Paris, 1947). English translation: E.A. Clark, *Jerome, Chrysostom and Friends: Essays and Translations*, Studies in Women and Religion 2 (New York and Toronto, 1979), 127–42

A.-M. Malingrey, *Jean Chrysostome: Sur le sacerdoce (Dialogue et homélie)*, SC 272 (Paris, 1980)

John of Antioch

C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* 4 (Paris, 1851), 535–622; 5 (Paris, 1870), 27–38

U. Roberto, *Iohannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 154 (Berlin and New York, 2005)

Marcellinus, *Chronicle*

T. Mommsen, *Chr. min.* 2.60–108. English translation: B. Croke, *The Chronicle of Marcellinus: Translation and Commentary*, Byzantina Australiensia 7 (Sydney, 1995), with improvements by Whitby 1996, 222–24

Menander Rhetor

Menander Rhetor, edited with translation and commentary by D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson (Oxford, 1981)

Palladius, *Dialogue* (BHG 870, 870e, 870f; CPG 6037)

P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi* (Cambridge, 1928)

A.-M. Malingrey (with P. Leclercq), *Palladios: Dialogue sur la vie de S. Jean Chrysostome* 1, SC 341 (Paris, 1988)

English translations:

H. Moore, *The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of Chrysostom* (London and New York, 1921)

R.T. Meyer, *Palladius: Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*, Ancient Christian Writers 45 (New York and Mahwah, NJ, 1985)

Photius, *Bibliotheca*

R. Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, 8 vols (Paris, 1959–77)

Pseudo-Codinus

T. Preger, *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum* 2: *Ps.-Codini Origines continens* (Leipzig, 1907)

Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*

G.C. Hansen (with the assistance of M. Sirinjan), *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte, GCS, Neue Folge* 1 (Berlin, 1995). Hansen's text is reprinted with a French translation *en face* by P. Périchon and P. Maraval in SC 477 (Paris, 2004), 493 (2005), 505 (2006), 506 (2007)

Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*

J. Bidez, revised by G.C. Hansen, *Sozomenos Kirchengeschichte, GCS, Neue Folge* 4 (Berlin, 1995). Hansen's text is reproduced with a French translation *en face* by various scholars in SC 306 (1983), 418 (1996), 495 (2005), 516 (2008)

Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae

H. Delehaye, *Acta Sanctorum*, Propylaeum ad Novembrem (Brussels, 1902)

Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica*

L. Parmentier, revised by G.C. Hansen, *Theodoretus Kirchengeschichte, GCS, Neue*

Folge 8 (Berlin, 1995). Hansen's text is reproduced with a French translation *en face* by P. Canivet in SC 501 (2006), 530 (2009)

Zosimus

Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, edited with a French translation by F. Paschoud (Paris, 1971–89); English translation: R.T. Ridley, *Zosimus: A Translation with Commentary*, Byzantina Australiensia 2 (Canberra, 1982)

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ameringer, T.E., 1921. 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyric Sermons of St. John Chrysostom. A Study in Greek Rhetoric' (diss., Washington, DC)
- Aubineau, M., 1975. 'Zôticos de Constantinople, nourricier de pauvres et serviteur des lépreux', *Analecta Bollandiana* 93: 67–108
- Ayres, L., and G. Jones (eds), 1998. *Christian Origins. Theology, Rhetoric and Community* (London)
- Bardenhewer, O., 1923. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* 3 (Freiburg im Breisgau)
- Barnes, T.D., 1978. 'An Anachronism in Claudian', *Historia* 27: 498–99
- , 1989. 'The Baptism of Theodosius II', *Studia Patristica* 19: 8–12
- , 1993. *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA, 1993)
- , 1995. Review of Alan Cameron and J. Long (with L. Sherry), *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (1993), *Classical Philology* 90: 91–96
- , 1996. 'Christians and the Theater', in *The Theater in Roman Society. E. Togo Salmon Papers I*, ed. W.J. Slater (Ann Arbor), 161–80. Reprinted with a brief addendum in *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interaction with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages*, ed. I. Gildenhard and M. Revermann (Berlin and New York, 2010), 315–34
- , 1997. 'The Collapse of the Homoeans in the East', *Studia Patristica* 29: 3–16
- , 2001. 'The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom (BHG³ 871 = CPG 6517)', *Studia Patristica* 37: 328–45
- , 2005. 'The Date of the Martyrdom of Lucian of Antioch', *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 9: 350–53
- , 2009. 'The Exile and Recalls of Arius', *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 60: 109–29
- , 2010. *Early Christian Hagiography and Roman History. Tria Corda. Jena Lectures on Judaism, Antiquity and Christianity*, ed. W. Ameling, K.-W. Niebuhr and M. Vielberg (Tübingen)
- , 2011. *Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Maldon, MA, Oxford and Chichester)

- , 2013. 'The First Christmas in Rome, Antioch and Constantinople', in *Studia Patristica* 64
- Bartelink, G., 1985. 'Parrhesia dans les œuvres de Jean Chrysostome', *Studia Patristica* 16: 441–48
- Baur, (J.) C., 1907. *S. Jean Chrysostome et ses œuvres dans l'histoire littéraire. Essai présenté à l'occasion du XVe centenaire de Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux publiés par les membres des conférences d'histoire et de philologie 18 (Louvain and Paris)
- , 1915. *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus Erzbischofs von Konstantinopel: Kommentar zum Evangelium des Hl. Matthäus aus dem griechischen übersetzt* 1, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 23 (Kempten)
- , 1927. 'Georgius Alexandrinus', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 27: 1–10
- , 1929, 1930. *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit* (Munich)
- , 1959, 1960. *John Chrysostom and his Time*, rev. edn of *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, translated into English by M. Gonzaga, 4 vols (London and Glasgow; reprinted, Vaduz, 1988)
- Bayer, F.W., 1950. 'Aussatz', *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* 1 (Stuttgart), 1023–28
- Baynes, N.H., 1955. 'Alexandria and Constantinople: A Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy', in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), 97–115. Reprinted from *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 12 (1926): 45–56
- Beck, H.-G., 1959. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 12.2.1 (Munich)
- Bernardi, J., 2004. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Œuvres poétiques*, ed. A. Tuilier and A. Bady, trans. J. Bernardi (Paris)
- Bonfiglio, E., 2010. 'Notes on the Manuscript Tradition of Anianus Celedensis' Translation of John Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Matthaem* [CPG 4424]', *Studia Patristica* 47: 287–93
- , 2011. 'John Chrysostom's Discourses on his First Exile. Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the *Sermo antequam iret in exsilium* and of the *Sermo cum iret in exsilium*' (diss., Oxford)
- Bonnet, C., 1996. *Astarté. Dossier documentaire et perspectives historiques. Contributi alla Storia della Religione Fenico-Punica – II*, Collezione di Studi Fenici 37 (Rome)
- Brändle, R., 1999. *Johannes Chrysostomus. Bischof – Reformator – Märtyrer* (Stuttgart, Berlin and Cologne)
- , 2008. 'This Sweetest Passage: Matthew 25:31–46 and Assistance to the Poor in the Homilies of John Chrysostom', in Holman 2008: 127–39
- Brennecke, H.C., 1988. *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 73 (Tübingen)
- Brottier, L., 1994. 'Le port, la tempête et le naufrage: sur quelques métaphores paradoxales employées par Jean Chrysostome', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 68: 145–58

- , 1996. 'L'impératrice Eudoxie et ses enfants', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 70: 313–32
- Burns, M.A., 1930. *Saint John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of their Rhetorical Qualities and Form*, Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 22 (Washington, DC)
- Butler, E.C., 1898. *The Lausiac History of Palladius* 1 (Cambridge)
- , 1908. 'Authorship of the Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi', in *Xrusostomika/Studi e ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo* (Rome), 35–46. Also published separately as *Estratto dal Volume Unico stampato a cura del Comitato per i festeggiamenti del XV^o Centenario di san Giovanni Crisostomo* (Rome, 1908)
- , 1921. 'Palladiana', *Journal of Theological Studies* 22: 21–35, 138–55, 222–28
- Cameron, Alan, 1970. *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford)
- , 1976. *Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium* (Oxford)
- , 1987. 'Earthquake 400', *Chiron* 17: 343–60
- , 1988. 'A Misidentified Homily of Chrysostom', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 32: 33–38
- , 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome* (New York)
- Cameron, Alan, and J. Long (with L. Sherry), 1993. *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 19 (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford)
- Cameron, Averil, and S. Hall, 1999. *Eusebius: Life of Constantine. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford)
- Campbell, J.M., 1922. *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great*, Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 2 (Washington, DC)
- Cavallera, F., 1905. *Le schisme d'Antioche (IV^e–V siècle)* (Paris)
- Cazzani, E., 1996. *Vescovi e arcivescovi di Milano* (Milan)
- Clark, E.A., 1979, see above, Ancient Authors, s.v. John Chrysostom
- Coleman-Norton, P.R., 1928, see above, Ancient Authors, s.v. Palladius
- , 1929. 'The Correspondence of S. John Chrysostom (with special reference to his Epistles to Pope S. Innocent I)', *Classical Philology* 24: 279–84
- Croke, B., 2001. *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle* (Oxford)
- Dagron, G., 1974. *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Bibliothèque Byzantine 7 (Paris)
- Delehay, H., 1902, see above, Ancient Authors, s.v. *Synaxarium*
- , 1905. 'Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae D. Marci Venetiarum', *Analecta Bollandiana* 24: 169–256
- Delmaire, R., 1991. 'Les "lettres d'exil" de Jean Chrysostome. Études de chronologie et de prosopographie', *Recherches augustiniennes* 25: 71–180
- Denniston, J.D., 1954. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn, rev K.J. Dover (Oxford)
- Devreesse, R., 1945. *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris)

- Dickey, E., 1996. *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford)
- Dickinson, F.W.A., 1926. *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom*, Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 26 (Washington, DC)
- Dinneen, L., 1929. *Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography to 527 A.D.*, Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 18 (Washington, DC)
- Downey, G., 1961. *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton)
- Ehrhard, A., 1952. *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*. 1. Die Überlieferung. 3.2.1/2, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 52.2 (Berlin)
- Elm, S., 1998. 'The Dog that did not Bark: Doctrine and Patriarchal Authority in the Conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople', in Ayres and Jones 1998: 66–93
- Finn, R., 2006. *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire. Christian Promotion and Practice (313–450)* (Oxford)
- Frend, W.H.C., 1972. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries* (Cambridge)
- Gaudemet, J., 1958. *L'Église dans l'Empire romain* (Paris)
- Greatrex, G., and J. Bardill, 1996. 'Antiochus the *Praepositus*: A Persian Eunuch at the Court of Theodosius II', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 50: 171–97
- Gregory, T.E., 1973. 'Zosimus, v. 23 and the people of Constantinople', *Byzantion* 43: 63–81
- Guignet, M., 1911. *S. Grégoire de Nazianze, orateur et épistolier* (Paris)
- Halkin, F., 1968. *Manuscripts grecs de Paris: Inventaire hagiographique*, Subsidia Hagiographica 44 (Brussels)
- , 1975. 'L'éloge de Jean Chrysostome par Proclus de Constantinople', *Analecta Bollandiana* 93: 20
- , 1976. 'Un appendice inédit à la vie de S. Jean Chrysostome par Syméon Métaphraste', *Analecta Bollandiana* 94: 19–21
- , 1977. *Douze récits byzantins sur saint Jean Chrysostom*, Subsidia Hagiographica 60 (Brussels)
- Harsing, C., 1910. *De optativi in chartis Aegyptiis usu* (diss., Bonn)
- Hartney, A.M., 2004. *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City* (London)
- Heck, E., 1987. *MH QEOMAXEIN, oder: Die Bestrafung des Gottesverächters* (Frankfurt, Bern and New York)
- Henry, R. de Lima, 1943. *The Late Greek Optative and its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen*, Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 68 (Washington, DC)
- Heyden, K., 2006. 'Die Christliche Geschichte des Philippos von Side. Mit einem kommentierten Katalog der Fragmente', in *Iulius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronik*, ed. M. Wallraff, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der

- altchristlichen Literatur 157 (Berlin), 209–43
- Hoey, G.W.P., 1930. *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. Gregory of Nyssa*, Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies 26 (Washington, DC)
- Holman, S.R. (ed.), 2008. *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society* (Grand Rapids, MI)
- Holum, K.G., 1982. *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Domination in Late Antiquity*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 3 (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London)
- Honigsmann, E., 1953. *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173 (Rome)
- Janin, R., 1953. *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantine* 1. *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarchate œcuménique*. 3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris)
- , 1964. *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et repertoire topographique. Édition révisée et augmentée* (Paris)
- Joannou, P.P., 1962a. Pontificia Commissione per la Redazione del Codice di Diritto Canonico Orientale. *Fonti. Fascicolo IX. Discipline générale antique (II^e–IX^e s.)* 1.1. *Les canons des conciles œcuméniques* (Grottaferrata / Rome)
- , 1962b. Pontificia Commissione per la Redazione del Codice di Diritto Canonico Orientale. *Fonti. Fascicolo IX. Discipline générale antique (II^e–IX^e s.)* 1.2. *Les canons des synodes particuliers* (Grottaferrata / Rome)
- Jones, A.H.M., 1953. 'St. John Chrysostom's Parentage and Education', *Harvard Theological Review* 46: 171–73
- Katos, D.S., 2011. *Palladius of Helenopolis: The Origenist Advocate* (Oxford)
- Kelly, J.N.D., 1986. *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford and New York)
- , 1995. *Golden Mouth. The Story of John Chrysostom – Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (London)
- Kotter, B., 1988. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos* 5. *Opera homiletica et hagiographica*, Patristische Texte und Studien 29 (Berlin and New York)
- Lascartos, J., 1996. 'The Second "Sacred Disease": Earlier Euphemistic Equivalents of "Hansen's Disease"', *International Journal of Dermatology* 35.5: 376–78
- Leclercq, H., 1908. C.J. Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*, translated and completely revised by H. Leclercq 2.1 (Paris)
- Leroy, F.J., 1967. *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantiople. Tradition manuscrite, inédits, études connexes*, Studi e Testi 247 (Vatican City)
- Leyerle, B., 2001. *Theatrical Shows and Ascetical Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley and London)
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 1990. *Barbarians and Bishops. Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford)
- , 2011. *Ambrose and John Chrysostom. Clerics between Desert and Empire* (Oxford)
- Lynch, J.H., 1986. *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton, NJ)
- McEnerney, J.I., 1985. *St. Cyril of Alexandria, Letters*, Fathers of the Church 76, 2 vols (Washington, DC)

- Malingrey, A.-M., 1961. "Philosophia." *Étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecques, des Présocratiques au IV^e siècle après J.-C.* (1961)
- , 1988. *Palladios: Dialogue sur la vie de S. Jean Chrysostome* 2, SC 341 (Paris)
- Malingrey, A.-M., and P. Leclercq, 1988, see above, *Ancient Authors*, s.v. *Palladius*
- Mansi, J.D., 1759. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova, et Amplissima Collectio* 3 (Florence)
- Matthews, J.F., 1975. *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425* (Oxford)
- Mayer, W., 2004. 'John Chrysostom as Bishop: The View from Antioch', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55: 455–66
- , with B. Neil, 2006. *St John Chrysostom: The Cult of the Saints. Select Homilies and Letters Introduced, Translated and Annotated*, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, Popular Patristic Series (Crestwood, NY)
- , 2008a. 'The Making of a Saint. John Chrysostom in Early Historiography', in Wallraff and Brändle 2008: 39–59
- , 2008b. 'Poverty and Generosity toward the Poor in the Time of John Chrysostom', in Holman 2008: 140–58
- Mayer, W., and P. Allen, 2000. *John Chrysostom* (London and New York)
- Méridier, L., 1906. *L'influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nysse* (Paris)
- Moulton, J.H., and N. Turner, 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* 3. *Syntax* (Edinburgh)
- Miller, T.S., and J.W. Nesbitt, 2005. 'Saint John Chrysostom and the "Holy Disease": An Excerpt from an Unpublished Anonymous Eulogy (BHG 871; CPG 6517)', *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 42: 33–43
- Nestle, W., 1948. 'Legenden vom Tod der Gottesverächter', *Griechische Studien. Untersuchungen zur Religion, Dichtung und Philosophie der Griechen* (Stuttgart), 567–96. Reprinted from *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 33 (1936), 246–69
- Neureiter, L., 2010. 'Health and Healing as Recurrent Topics in John Chrysostom's Correspondence with Olympias', *Studia Patristica* 47: 267–72
- Norden, E., 1909. *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2nd edn (Leipzig)
- Norton, R.T., 1925. 'The Vita s. Chrysostomi by Georgius Alexandrinus', *Classical Philology* 20: 69–72
- Ommeslaeghe, F. van, 1974. *De Lijkrede voor Johannes Chrysostomus toegeschreven aan Martyrius van Antiochie. Tekstuutgave met Commentaar, Hoofdstukken uit de Historische Kritiek* (diss., Leuven)
- , 1975. 'La valeur historique de la Vie de S. Jean Chrysostome attribuée à Martyrius d'Antioche (BHG 871)', *Studia Patristica* 12 = *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 115 (Berlin), 478–83
- , 1976. 'Une vie acéphale de Saint Jean Chrysostome dans le Batopedinus 73', *Analecta Bollandiana* 94: 317–56
- , 1977. 'Que vaut le témoignage de Pallade sur le process de Saint Jean Chrysostome?', *Analecta Bollandiana* 95: 389–413

- , 1979. 'Jean Chrysostome en conflit avec l'impératrice Eudoxie. Le dossier et les origines d'une légende', *Analecta Bollandiana* 97: 131–59
- , 1981. 'Jean Chrysostome et le peuple de Constantinople', *Analecta Bollandiana* 99: 329–49
- , 1992. 'Chrysostomica. La nuit de Pâques 404', *Analecta Bollandiana* 110: 123–33
- Omout, H., 1888. *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* 2 (Paris)
- Pagi, A., 1705. *Critica historico-chronologica in universos Annales Ecclesiasticos eminentissimi et reverendissimi Caesaris Cardinalis Baronii* (Antwerp)
- Pargoire, J., 1899. 'Rufinians', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 8: 429–77
- Peeters, P., 1913. 'S. Hilarion d'Ibérie', *Analecta Bollandiana* 32: 236–69
- Petit, P., 1957. *Les Étudiants de Libanius: un professeur de faculté et ses élèves au Bas-Empire*, Études prosopographiques 1 (Paris)
- Quantan, J.-L., 2008. 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec. Une histoire européenne', in Wallraff and Brändle 2008: 267–346
- Rapp, C., 2001. 'Palladius, Lausus and the *Historia Lausiaca*', in *Novum Millennium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck, 19 December 1999*, ed. C. Sode and S. Takács (Aldershot, Burlington, VT, Singapore and Sydney), 279–89
- Rauschen, G., 1897. *Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius dem Grosse. Versuch einer Erneuerung der Annales Ecclesiastici des Baronius für die Jahren 378–395* (Freiburg im Breisgau)
- Robert, L., 1994. *Le martyre de Pionios de Smyrne*, rev. G.W. Bowersock and C.P. Jones (Washington, DC)
- Rouché, C., 1989. *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* (with contributions from J.M. Reynolds), *Journal of Roman Studies Monographs* 5 (London)
- Ruether, R.R., 1969. *Gregory of Nazianzus. Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford)
- Russell, N., 2007. *Theophilus of Alexandria* (London and New York)
- Sawhill, J.A., 1928. *The Use of Athletic Metaphors in the Biblical Homilies of St. John Chrysostom* (diss. 1926; Princeton, NJ)
- Seeck, O., 1906. *Die Briefe des Libanius*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur N.F. 15.1–2 (Leipzig)
- , 1919. *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr. Vorarbeit zu einer Prosopographie der christlichen Kaiserzeit* (Stuttgart)
- Ševčenko, I., 1992. 'Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus', in *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. J. Shepard and S. Franklin, *Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies Publications* 1 (Cambridge), 167–95
- Sophocles, E.A., 1887. *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (New York)
- Stephens, W.R.W., 1889. 'Correspondence of St. Chrysostom with the Bishop of Rome', in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 9, ed. P. Schaff (Grand Rapids, MI), 407–16

- Stilting, J., 1868. 'De S. Joanne Chrysostomo episcopo Constantinopolitano et ecclesiae doctore, prope Comana in Ponto, commentarius historicus', *Acta Sanctorum Septembris* 4 (Paris and Rome, 1868), 401–700; identical pagination in the original edition (Antwerp, 1753)
- Straeten, J. van der, 1995. 'Le Père Florent van Ommeslaeghe', *Analecta Bollandiana* 113: 5–12
- Teitler, H.C., 1985. *Notarii and Exceptores. Enquiry into Role [sic] and Significance of Shorthand Writers in the Imperial and Ecclesiastical Bureaucracy of the Roman Empire (from the Early Principate to c. 450 A.D.)*, Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 1 (Amsterdam)
- Tiersch, C., 2002a. *Johannes Chrysostomus in Konstantinopel (398–404). Weltsicht und Wirken eines Bischofs in der Hauptstadt des Oströmischen Reiches*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 6 (Tübingen)
- , 2002b. 'Wie christlich darf ein Bischof sein? Johannes Chrysostomus, Bischof von Konstantinopel (398–404), im Spiegel zweier Biographien', in *Biographie als religiöser und kultureller Text / Biography as a Religious and Cultural Text*, ed. A. Schüle (Münster, Hamburg and London), 125–52
- Tixeront, J., 1925. *L'ordre et les ordinations. Étude de théologie historique* (Paris)
- Trapp, E., et al., 2001. *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik* 6. *Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 238, 250, 276, 293, 326, 352. *Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik* VI/1–4 (Vienna)
- Ubaldi, P., 1903. 'La sinodo "ad Quercum" dell'anno 403', *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Serie Seconda: Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 52 (Turin), 33–97
- Vandenbergh, B.H., 1955. 'Saint Jean Chrysostome et les spectacles', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 7: 34–46
- Vanderspoel, J., 1986. 'Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints', *Classical Quarterly*, N.S. 36: 239–55
- Wallraff, M., 2005. 'L'epitaffio di un contemporaneo per Giovanni Crisostomo ("Ps.-Martirio"). Inquadramento di una fonte biografica finora trascurata', in *Giovanni Crisostomo. Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo. XXIII Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità Cristiana*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 93 (Rome), 37–49
- , 2008. 'Tod im Exil. Reaktionen auf die Todesnachricht des Johannes Chrysostomos und Konstituierung einer "johannistischen" Opposition', in Wallraff and Brändle 2008: 23–37
- Wallraff, M., and R. Brändle (eds), 2008. *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren. Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 105 (Berlin and New York)
- Walsh, E.M., 2008. 'Wealthy and Impoverished Widows in the Writings of St. John Chrysostom', in Holman 2008: 176–86

- Wenger, A., 1961. 'L'homélie de saint Jean Chrysostom "à son retour d'Asie"', *Mélanges Raymond Janin. Revue des Études byzantines* 19: 110–23
- Whitby, Michael, 1996. Review of B. Croke, *The Chronicle of Marcellinus* (Sydney, 1995), *Early Medieval Europe* 5: 222–25
- Wilson, N.G., 1994. *Photius: The Bibliotheca. A Selection Translated with Notes* (London)
- Zilliacus, H., 1949. *Untersuchungen zu den abstrakten Anredeformen und Höflichkeitstiteln im Griechischen*, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 15, Nr. 3 (Helsinki)

INDEX

This index covers both the text and the notes of our translations of the *Funerary Speech* and of the letters of John, of the introduction to the translations, and of the appendices. It registers significant occurrences of (1) the names of ancient persons (except John himself), ancient authors and texts, and place-names, normally in their ancient form; (2) selected subjects and topics; and (3) modern scholars whose views are evaluated or discussed, not merely cited, adduced or dismissed, but it excludes all references to Wallraff and Ricci in the notes to our translation of the *Funerary Speech* itself.

- Abel, 38
- Ablabius, praetorian prefect and consul (331), 110n
- Abraham, 38, 84n, 90
- Acacius, bishop of Beroea in Syria, 5n, 8n, 62n, 64–65, 86, 87, 99, 153, 155, 157n
- Acacius, deacon, 154
- Acacius, priest, 159
- Acheiropoietos, church of, 107
- Adam, 41, 88
- Aegae, 142
- Aelius Aristides, 2n
- Aemilianus, prefect of the city of Constantinople, 127
- Aetius, recipient of letter from John, 124, 138
- Alexander, bishop of Antioch, 4, 123
- Almsgiving, 74
- Ambrose, bishop of Milan, 5, 132, 170
- Ammonius, bishop of Laodicea Combusta, 86n, 89–92, 95–96
- Ammonius, one of the ‘Tall Brothers,’ 62–63, 157
- Anastasia, Church of St., 80, 153
- Anastasius, bishop of Rome, 170
- Anatolius, father of Gemellus, 127
- Anatolius, recipient of letter from John, 124, 141
- Anaunensian martyrs, relics of, 29–30
- Andragathius, 1n, 165
- Anianus of Celeda, 16, 17, 27
- Anthemius, praetorian prefect and consul (405), 8n, 122, 124–26, 145
- Anthusa, mother of John, 1, 164, 165
- Antioch, 1–2, 4, 22, 42, 44–45, 104n, 113, 123, 164, 165
- Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 105
- Antiochus, bishop of Ptolemais, 8n, 62n, 64, 88n, 96, 99, 153, 157n
- Antiochus, eunuch, 105
- Antiochus, recipient of letter from John, 126, 137–38
- Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus, 154
- Antonius, consecrated bishop by John, 154
- Apostolic Constitutions*, 71
- Aquilinus, deacon, 156

- Arabissos, 3, 129, 167, 173
 Arcadia, daughter of Arcadius and Eudoxia, 5, 25, 32
 Arcadius, Augustus (383–408), 3, 4, 17, 19–20, 24, 28–29, 30, 44n, 46n, 47n, 48, 63, 68, 88–89, 90, 93n, 96, 165, 159
 Arcadius, praetorian prefects of, 125
 Aristophanes, 154n
 Arius, 44, 67, 94, 96n
 Ark of the Covenant, 30
 Armenia, *dux* of, 132
 Arsacius, bishop of Constantinople, 102, 105, 111n, 112, 132, 158–59
 Arsenius, bishop of Hypsele, 94n
 Asia, John's visit to, 29, 65n, 78–79
 Asiana, diocese of, 52
 Assassination of John, attempts at, 97–98
 Astarte, 110
 Asterius, *comes Orientis*, 3
 Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, 5, 78n, 79n, 87n, 94–96
 Athletic contests, 7, 51–52, 55
 Atticism, 7–8
 Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, 4, 5, 82, 102, 104n, 112–13, 114–15, 158–59, 169–70
 Aurelianus, praetorian prefect and consul (400), 32, 66n, 125
 Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, 123, 126, 148

 Babylon, 162
 Bacurius, 66n
 Balaam, 100
 Balak, 100
 Baptism, 1, 18, 25, 32, 42, 83
 Basil of Caesarea, 8, 133, 134, 165n
 Basil *the protothronos*, 11
 Basiliscus, martyr revered at Comana Pontica, 4, 167
 Baur, Chrysostomus, 14–15, 16n, 17–18, 24, 77n
 Baynes, Norman, 20, 60n
 Bithynia, 61
 Black Sea, 4, 61, 78, 102, 114
 Blockley, R.P.C., 29n
 Bonfiglio, Emilio, 16–17
 Bosphorus, 19n, 71, 76, 102
 Briso, eunuch, 78n, 126, 140–41
 Butler, Dom Cuthbert, 21

 Caesarea in Cappadocia, 122, 127, 129, 142–43n, 173
 Caesarius, praetorian prefect and consul (397), 125
 Caiaphas, 117
 Cain, 70
 Cameron, Alan, 29n, 154–55n
 Cameron, Alan, and Jacqueline Long, 29n, 68n
 Carterius, governor of Cappadocia Secunda, 122, 127, 136, 143n
 Castabala, 131, 142
 Chalcedon, 51n, 61n, 69n, 19, 102n
 Chariot-racing, 40, 57
 Christ: see Jesus
 Christmas, 24, 166
 Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, 123, 127, 148
 Cicero, 2n
 Claudian, 2n, 40n
 Comana Pontica, 4–5, 14, 32, 114n, 166–67n
 Constans, Augustus (337–350), 110n
 Constantine Porphyrogenetus, 10n, 11
 Constantine, Augustus (306–337), 92, 93; Baths of, 92–93n
 Constantinople, 22, 24n, 45–48, 66n, 67, 92–93, 122, 142, 162; burning of senate house, 100–01; senate of, 46, 96, 167; status of its bishop, 52n; Theophilus' arrival in, 61

- Constantius, Augustus (337–361), 1, 92–93n, 94
- Cosmas Vestitor, 11
- Cosmas, deacon of the Church of the Holy Apostles, 8–9, 10, 11–12, 32, 33
- Councils of bishops:
- 325 Nicaea, 18,
 - 327 or 338 Antioch, 20n, 95n, 96
 - 334 Caesarea in Palaestina, 94n
 - 335 Tyre 94n
 - 338 Antioch, 78n, 94n
 - 339, Antioch, 94n
 - 341 Antioch, 20n, 95n, 96
 - 341 Rome, 95n
 - 343 Serdica, 87n
 - 349 Antioch, 94n
 - 355 Milan, 94n
 - 360 Constantinople, 44n, 67n
 - 381 Constantinople, 18n, 20, 52n, 95n
 - 403 Council of the Oak, 2, 3, 5, 18, 19, 64, 69–73, 79–82, 113n, 153–59
 - 403–404 Constantinople, 87–88
 - 405 Rome, 19, 87n, 113
 - 431 Ephesus, 81n
 - 451 Chalcedon, 5, 52n, 78n
 - 536 Constantinople, 81n
- Croke, Brian, 4–5n
- Cucusus, 3–4, 102–03, 122, 130, 135–38, 165, 166, 167
- Cyclopes, 80n, 155
- Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, 4, 5, 10
- Daniel, 28, 51
- David, 30, 38, 49, 68, 69, 83, 108, 110
- Delmaire, Roland, 121, 123–24, 130–31, 133, 173
- Demetrias, daughter of Olybrius and Juliana, 128
- Demophilus, bishop of Constantinople, 67n
- Demosthenes, 2
- Devil, 38, 54–60, 61–66, 75, 81, 85–87, 91, 103, 106, 107, 112, 136–37
- Dinneen, Lucilla, 133–34
- Dioscorus, one of the ‘Tall Brothers,’ 62–63, 157n
- Drypia, 30
- Easter, 8n, 17, 42, 81, 89–90, 92–93n
- Edaphius, deacon, 154
- Egypt, 18, 19–20n, 21, 33, 39, 60–61, 62–63, 91, 94, 116
- Elijah, 28, 39, 116
- Elisha, 39, 116
- Ensslin, W., 130n
- Ephesus, 159n, 162, 169
- Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, 27, 63n, 154, 157
- Eudaimon, at the Council of the Oak, 159
- Eudoxia, Augusta (400–404), 3, 17, 19n, 24–32, 33, 39n 44n, 46n, 59–60, 61–62n, 63n, 66, 77–78, 88, 90, 105n, 115, 126, 165, 166; two stillbirths, 77, 104–05
- Euethius, recipient of letter from John, 129, 133
- Eugnomonius, bishop deposed by John, 159
- Eugraphia, 62n
- Eulalius, slave, allegedly beaten by John, 153
- Eunapius, 29n
- Eusebius of Caesarea, 38n, 40n
- Eusebius, author of epic poem on Gainas, 65n
- Eusebius, bishop of Ephesus, 29n
- Eusebius, bishop of Valentinopolis, 29n
- Eusebius, one of the ‘Tall Brothers,’ 62–63, 157
- Eustathius the *primicerius*, 11
- Euthemius, one of the ‘Tall Brothers,’ 62–63, 157

- Eutropius, consul (399), 2–3, 31, 66n, 154n, 158n
- Eutropius, follower of John, 58, 107
- Eutychianus, praetorian prefect and consul (398), 104n, 125–26
- Evagrius Ponticus, 11n, 157n
- Evagrius the ascetic, 11
- Eve, 41, 88
- Fasti Vindobonenses priores*, 32n
- Faustinus, bishop deposed by John, 159
- Firmus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 134
- Flaccilla, daughter of Arcadius and Eudoxia, 25, 32
- Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, 2, 104n, 164, 165
- Fravitta, consul (401), 69n
- Gainas, 32, 65–69, 154n, 160
- Galatia, 86, 89, 133n
- Gehazi, 77
- Gehenna, 76, 77, 86
- Gemellus, prefect of the city of Constantinople, 33, 122, 123, 127; letters of John to, 135, 146, 149–50, 152
- Gennadius of Marseille, 25, 32
- George Codinus, 107n
- George, bishop of Alexandria and author of a *Life of John*, 10, 28, 154n
- Germanus, guardian of church treasures, 101n
- Gerontius, bishop of Nicomedia, 159
- Gildo, 170
- Godparents, 25n
- Goliath, 69
- Goths, 53–54, 67–68n, 162
- Gregory of Nazianzus, 7, 8, 133
- Gregory of Nyssa, 7, 8, 133
- Gymnasius, bishop, 159
- Hagia Sophia, church of, 10n, 168; consumed by fire, 100–01
- Halkin, François, 10n
- Helpidius, bishop of Laodicea, 82, 96
- Helpidius, priest, 97n, 159
- Heraclides, bishop of Ephesus, 153, 156–57, 159
- Herculius, recipient of letter from John, 128, 144–45
- Herodias, 26, 27, 28
- Hippodrome, 57, 93
- Holy Apostles, Church of the, 5, 10, 12, 22, 156, 164, 167
- Honorius, Augustus (393–423), 68, 113, 159n
- Huns, 2, 69n
- Innocentius, bishop of Rome, 19–21, 87n, 113n, 122, 124
- Irene, Church of St., 167
- Isaac, son of Abraham, 38
- Isaac, enemy of John, 85n, 157, 158
- Isaurians, 3, 135, 143–44, 147, 167
- Isidore of Pelusium, 10, 124
- Isidore, priest at Alexandrian, 3, 60n, 63
- Italica, noble lady in Rome, 128, 131, 151–52
- Jacob, 38
- Jeremiah, 28
- Jerome, 128
- Jesus, 56, 59n; John compared or assimilated to, 49, 59n, 76–77, 85–86, 88, 91, 96, 99, 116–17, 157
- Jews of Constantinople, 84
- Jezebel, 26–28, 29, 39, 59–60, 115, 166
- Job, 33, 38, 54–56, 85, 137, 163
- Johannes, *comes* and favourite of Eudoxia, 32, 66n, 154
- Johannites, 6, 14, 93n, 100, 169

- John Cassian, 101n
 John of Damascus, 10
 John the Baptist, 27, 28, 39, 157n
 John, apostle, 167
 John, deacon, 153, 158
 John, monk, 153, 156
 John, priest commended to Proba, 151
 Jonah, 28, 163
 Joseph, 28, 38, 39, 114, 115–16
 Joshua, 116
 Julian, Augustus (360–363), 59n
 Juliana, noble lady in Rome, 128, 131, 151
- Katos, Demetrios, 22
 Kellia, 157n
 Kelly, J.N.D., 6, 12–13n, 20, 28–29, 122, 169
- Latin, John's knowledge of, 68n
 Lemnian hand, 97
 Leo, emperor (870–902), 11
 Leontius, bishop of Ancyra, 86, 89–92, 95–96
 Leontius, prefect of the city of Constantinople, 51n
 Leontius, recipient of letter from John, 128–29, 133, 135
 Lepers, John's hospice for, 33, 74–76, 81
 Libanius, 1, 2n, 45n, 68n, 127, 165
 Licinius, Augustus (308–324), 93n
 Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 12n, 28–29
 Lucian of Antioch, 167
 Lucius, military officer, 91, 93n
- Macarius, bishop of Magnesia, 153
 Magnentius, usurper, 1n
 Mai, Cardinal Angelo, 14, 171
 Malingrey, Ann-Marie, 74n, 121, 123, 153n, 173
 Malingrey, Ann-Marie, and Philippe Leclercq, 21–22
 Marcellinus, chronicler, 4–5n, 23, 170
 Marcellinus, recipient of letters from John, 129, 137, 145
 Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, 78n
 Marcian, Augustus (450–457), 5
 Marcianus, recipient of letter from John, 129, 143–44
Marianae, suburb of Constantinople, 78n
 Marina, daughter of Arcadius and Eudoxia, 5, 25
 Marinianus, recipient of letter from John, 129–30, 150
 Mark the Deacon, alleged author of the *Life of Porphyry, Bishop of Gaza*, 15–16, 25
 Martindale, John, 130–31
 Martyrius, archdeacon in Constantinople, 156
 Martyrius, bishop of Antioch, 10, 13, 14, 15
 Marutha, Persian bishop, 99n
 Mayer, Wendy, 22
 Meletius, bishop of Antioch, 1–2, 42, 164, 165
 Memnon, allegedly punched by John, 156
 Menander Rhetor, 40n
 Mocius, martyr, 24n
 Monks, 41, 53, 63, 70, 83, 127, 157n
 Montfaucon, Bernard de, 16–18
 Moses, 29n, 38, 83, 84–85, 116
- Naboth, 29, 59, 115
 Nebuchadnezzar, 93
 Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, 2–3, 44n, 48, 60n, 80n, 102n, 153, 164, 165, 169–70
 Nehemiah, leper, 77
 Nicaea, 5, 121
 Nicetas the Paphlagonian, 11
 Nicetas the *skeuophylax*, 11

- Nicomedia, 5, 78, 111n, 167
 Nilus of Ancyra, 10, 134
 Nocturnal prayers, 57
 Norden, Eduard, 8
Notarii, imperial, 72, 78n, 99
- Olybrius, consul (395), husband of
 Juliana, 128, 131
 Olympias, 50n, 57n, 98n, 110–11,
 122n, 123, 173
 Olympic games, 51–52, 55
 Ommeslaeghe, Florent van, 12, 13, 15,
 156n
 Onesimus, at the Council of the Oak,
 159
 Optative mood in ancient Greek, 7–8
 Optatus, prefect of the city of
 Constantinople, 33, 106–07,
 110–11, 127, 130–31
 Origen, 63
 Origenism, 63n, 156, 157, 158
- Pacanius, prefect of the city of
 Constantinople, 33, 106, 122,
 130–31; letters from John to,
 136–37, 138–39, 141–143
 Pagi, 168
 Palestine, 142
 Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis and
 Aspuna, 21, 104n, 113–14n, 131,
 144, 156; as source of Marcel-
 linus, 23; on council of bishops
 in Rome in 405, 113; on Eudox-
 ia's enmity towards John, 26–28,
 29; his *Historical Dialogue on*
 John, 1n, 4n, 9, 14, 15, 16n, 18,
 19, 21–22, 67n, 74n, 81, 104n,
 159; the *Dialogue* contrasted
 with the *Funerary Speech*,
 32–33, 77n, 86, 89n, 92n, 96n;
 modern editions of, 172
 Pancratius, invented bishop of Tauro-
 menium, 11n
- Paradise, 41, 49
Patria of Constantinople, 107n
 Paul, apostle, 28, 31, 37n, 39, 43, 59,
 86, 95, 158n, 169
 Paul, bishop of Constantinople, 23,
 102–103n
 Paul, bishop of Crateia, 90n
 Paul, bishop of Heraclea, 159
 Paul, deacon commended to Proba, 151
 Pergamius, bishop of Nicaea, 132
 Persia, 53–54, 105–106, 162
 Peter, apostle, 39, 91–92, 95, 100, 167
 Pharetrius, bishop of Caesarea in
 Cappadocia, 142–43
 Philip of Side, ecclesiastical historian,
 8, 12n
Philotimia, 53, 56
 Phoebe, 30, 110
 Phoenicia, 110n, 142
 Photius, 19, 153–63
 Pityus, 4, 114n, 167
 Pontica, diocese of, 52
 Porphyrius, alleged victim of John, 155
 Porphyrius, bishop of Antioch, 4n,
 104n
 Porphyry, bishop of Gaza, fictitious life
 of, 15–16, 25, 28–29
 Potiphar's wife, 28
 Praenetum, 78n
 Prefects of the city of Constantinople,
 33, 127, 130–31
 Priscilla, 30
 Proba, noble lady in Rome, 123, 131,
 151
 Probinus, consul (395), husband of
 Italica, 128, 131
 Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, 5, 9,
 11n, 15, 166–67
 Prohaeresius, bishop in Lycia, 156
Protopresbuteroi, 158
 Pulcheria, daughter of Arcadius and
 Eudoxia, 25, 29n, 32

- Quintilian, 2n
 Quirinus, bishop of Chalcedon, 99, 153

 Rameses, 84, 91–92
 Ricci, Cristina, 13
 Rome, 22, 45, 95, 104n, 113, 123, 128, 131, 151, 170; bishops of, 19, 20–21, 52n, 61n, 87n
 Rufinus, monk, recipient of a letter from John, 124
 Rufinus, praetorian prefect, 20n, 66n, 69n

 Salome, 27, 157n
 Sarah, wife of Abraham, 84n
 Saturninus, general and consul (383), 32, 66n
 Saul, Old Testament king, 49, 69
 Saul, Roman general, 66n
 Savile, Sir Henry, 9, 10n, 21
 Sawhill, J. A., 7
 Second Sophistic movement, 7–8, 79n
 Secundus, father of John, 1, 164, 165
 Seeck, O., 124, 125n
 Serapion, archdeacon, 59n
 Serapion, deacon of John and bishop of Heraclea, 155, 156
 Severianus, bishop of Gabala, 8n, 25, 32, 48, 59, 62n, 64, 85n, 96n, 99, 153, 154, 155, 157n
 Simon (Acts 8.18–19), 47
 Simplicius, prefect of the city of Constantinople, 27n, 98
 Simplicius, bishop of Milan, 132
 Siricius, bishop of Rome, 170
 Socrates, ecclesiastical historian, 9, 23, 25, 26–27, 65n, 168–69
 Solomon, 58, 108–09, 110
 Sophiano, Michael, 9
 Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, 10
 Sozomen, ecclesiastical historian, 9, 12, 15, 17, 23, 26–27, 71n

 Stephen, the first martyr, 28, 72–73
 Stilling, 9n, 125n
 Studius, prefect of the city of Constantinople, 104n, 121, 122, 124, 130, 131, 132, 140
 Syene, 21
 Symeon the logothete, 13, 14
Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, 24, 164–70
 Synesius, 67n

 Tabitha (Acts 9.36), 63
 ‘Tall Brothers,’ the, 62–63, 63, 157
 Tarsus, 142
 Theatres, 51, 57
 Thecla, benefactress of the church in Constantinople, 80–81n, 155
 Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, 131, 142
 Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, 10, 15, 22–23, 77n, 84n, 103n, 104n, 134; his orations on John, 160–163
 Theodorus, bishop of Trimithous, 10n
 Theodorus, deacon at Rome, 21
 Theodosius, Augustus (379–395), 66n, 67, 68, 95n
 Theodosius, recipient of letter from John, 132, 146–47
 Theodosius, son of Arcadius and Eudoxia, 4–5, 25, 32
 Theodotus, bishop of Antioch, 4n
 Theodotus, deacon in Antioch, 147
 Theodotus, lector, 147
 Theodotus, recipient of letter from John, 132, 147
 Theodulus, 80–81n, 155
 Theognostus, invented character, 28–29
 Theophilus, 95n, 97, 157n
 Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, 2–3, 18, 19–21, 47n, 60–65, 70, 79, 84–85, 153
 Thessalonica, 113n

- Thrace, diocese of, 52
Tillemont, 21
Tranquillus, opponent of John, 96n
Tribigild, 66n
Troilus, sophist from Side, 8, 65n

Ubaldi, Paolo, 20

Valerianus, *tribunus*, 72n, 113n
Venerius, bishop of Milan, 123, 132, 149
Venerius, priest, 155
Verona: Biblioteca Capitolare LX[58], 95n
Vigilius, bishop of Tridentum, 29–30

Wallraff, Martin, 8, 12n, 13, 72n, 171
Wilamowitz von Moellendorf, U., 2n
Wilson, N. G., 154n, 158n

Zachariah, 83
Zilliacus, Hendrik, 133